Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

quently, water development in southern Idaho has been stalemated for a number of years.

Happily, the Teton project is not fraught with this kind of controversy. It is a multiple-purpose project with benefits of flood control and irrigation, as well as the production of a modest amount of power, though little more than necessary for the needs of the project itself. Ultimately, it will not only mean supplemental irrigation water for land now being irrigated with an insufficient supply, but it will bring new land under irrigation as well. Thus, it unquestionably meets the criteria for multiple purpose development, so well established under our reclamation laws.

I am pleased to say that this project has the endorsement of the business community, the farm community, and the irrigation districts. It has been supported by my colleague, and it has enjoyed bipartisan support in the Senate. It has the approval of the Governor of the State and of both our Representatives in Congress. I know of no important group in Idaho that has taken a stand against it.

So, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to pass the bill. I do so in the hope that our action now may make it possible to secure the approval of the House of Representatives in this session. If that can be done, the comprehensive development of Idaho's water resources in the Upper Snake River Basin can commence again, and the future of our State, through the full utilization of our water, will be better assured.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be nofurther amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1123) was passed.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

REMOVAL OF BILL FROM CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 909, the bill (S. 1790), a bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, be taken off the calendar because the bill was passed by the Senate several days ago.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE AND FOR THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment or recess of the Senate today, the Secretary may receive messages from the House, and the President pro tempore or the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1063, the bill H.R. 11049, and that the bill be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert new language.

"BLUNT WARNING BY 40 EARS"—MICROPHONES IN U.S. EMBASSY IN MOSCOW

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the 40 microphones planted 10 years ago in our Embassy in Moscow by the Kremlin is a disaster for the American people and for the nations of the West. Most civilized people will consider this newly discovered, long-range thievery to be as bad as Stalin's theft of our atomic secrets soon after the so-called end of World War II, for it is a certainty that Khrushchev's line of peaceful coexistence now reveals itself to be a fraud based on conspiracy and deceit.

It is therefore heartening to read in the Washington Post and in the New York Times on May 25, 1964, a careful analysis of this latest piece of Communist perfidy, whereby vital U.S. diplomatic, military, and scientific secrets were stolen from us during those 10 fateful years.

Authored by Mr. A. N. Spanel, the founder of International Latex Corp., and presented by the company in paid newspaper space, as a public service, this editorial-advertisement, which is entitled "Blunt Warning by 40 Ears," should be carefully studied by foreign ministers and their staffs and by ambassadors and their assistants throughout the whole free world, with our own foremost among them.

I submit that Mr. Spanel and his corporation have again demonstrated, as in the past 25 years, their extraordinary patriotism and citizenship on behalf of our country and our allies; and for this they deserve highest recognition everywhere.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Spanel be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLUNT WARNING BY 40 EARS

(By A. N. Spanel, founder-chairman, International Latex Corp.)

Perfidy has been for so long a fixed element in the record and reputation of Soviet Russia that it has lost most of its earlier power to shock and anger its victims. Kremlin duplicities are by now accepted calmly, almost as if they represented a natural phenomenon.

Only that can explain the complacency with which the American public has received the State Department announcement that 40 microphones have been dug out of the walls of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. But it is an ominous piece of news, one which we would do well to take seriously and ponder deeply.

The real danger is that, in our current eagerness to swallow Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence line, we may treat this latest evidence of Kremlin treachery too lightly—that we may ignore the grim warning it packs, for fear of disturbing the complications of wishful thinking and self-delusion.

The discovery of the "bugging" of our Embassy, on a scale and for a duration without precedent even in the annals of Communist deceit, could be a blessing in disguise if it served to end the soporific myth that communism has changed its nature. It could be a reminder, perhaps in the nick of time, that the Red leopard, for all of Khrushchev's purring and meowing, hasn't turned into a pussycat.

WE HAVE BEEN WARNED

But if the reminder goes unheeded, if it does not compel us to reappraise the beguiling coexistence formula, we shall find ourselves more inextricably in the Soviet trap for America and the free world. We shall then be set up for another Pearl Harbor, this time of the nuclear variety.

Commonsense is our guarantee that if the Kremlin, for over 10 years has been eavesdropping on our Embassy staff, as well as on the conversations of visiting military men, scientists and foreign diplomats, Khrushchev has been playing diplomatic poker with us, with marked cards. Unfortunately the stakes in this game are nothing less than the future, the very survival, of America and the Western civilization of which it is a part.

Only the naive, the blind and the Communist-infected will minimize and wish away this decade-long exercise in treachery. It is their kind who once explained, in tones guttured and raucous, that we could do business with Hitler if only we "tried to understand the wave of the future."

The same voices are again being heard, pleading every imaginable argument with insistent optimism dished up to whet our appetites for lucrative trade. There are, alas, too many in our Western World not only but eager to barter principles for the mirage of commerce with Communists, though a third

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

the United Nations Charter. If it were not so tragic, it would be amusing, when one considers the answer he has given to the proposal to go to a 14-nation conference, as recommended by the President of France, Mr. de Gaulle. What are we afraid of? No one is suggesting that while we are at that 14-nation Conference we should abandon southeast Asia. No one is suggesting that while the Security Council and, if necessary, the General Assembly consider the United Nations jurisdiction, we remove ourselves from southeast Asia, although I wish we would desist from our warmaking in southeast Asia and start a policy of peacekeeping.

I would, as I have said so many times, while the matter is before a 14-nation Conference, as recommended by De Gaulle, or before the Security Council or before the General Assembly, call upon our alleged—and I underline the word "alleged"—SEATO allies to join us with a sufficient body of men to patrol the area, to keep the adversaries separate, and to stop the killing and warmaking until the procedures of the United Nations can be brought to work upon the threat to the peace of Asia and, potentially, the peace of the world.

The position taken by Henry Cabot Lodge cannot be reconciled to any degree with the clear international obligations of the United States under the United Nations Charter.

I did not expect that the stature of the President of France for peacekeeping would rise above the stature of the President of the United States; but at this hour, that is exactly what is happening. The President of France is becoming recognized in many areas of the world as more determined and dedicated to the cause of peace than the President of the United States, because the President of France is calling for negotiation. The President of France is calling for the conference table. The President of France is calling for the application of the rule of law to the threat of peace in Asia

The President of the United States is rattling the saber and telling the world that we are willing to risk war with Red China unless Asia accepts American policy in southeast Asia.

I cannot understand why my Government cannot see, before it is too late, that that kind of warmaking policy on the part of the United States spells trouble. Let me make it clear, as I close, that there is no question that we are joined in our outlawry by South Vietnam, by North Vietnam, by the Pathet Lao Communists in Laos, and by Red China.

Does that justify our outlawry? Does that justify the policy of expediency applied to international affairs which best describes American policy tonight in Asia? Does the end-justifies-the-means principle square with American precepts of foreign policy?

Since when do two wrongs make a right?

Never before has that been our policy. I pray again that my country will see the horrendous mistake it is making in Asia as a matter of policy, before it is too late.

I close by saying, for the benefit of those who do not like my speeches and for the benefit of such journalists as Mr. Freedman, "You had better check it with the American people."

I am satisfied that millions of fellow Americans, as they begin to understand the issue at stake in southeast Asia, will support my position.

I can now say, along with the Senator from Alaska, that my mail is running better than 100 to 1 in support of my position. My mail is coming in from coast to coast, as Senators will see some samples placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from time to time. I placed a large quantity in the RECORD today. It is coming from the leaders of many communities in this country.

I wish to state to President Johnson that I am satisfied that the American people do not approve of America's warmaking policy in Asia, and that the American people wish the President of the United States to join with the President of France and other advocates of negotiation, that we go to the conference table and seek to apply the rule of law to the crisis which exists in Asia.

I say most respectfully to my President, whom I shall continue to support on most issues, that I oppose him on this issue only because I owe a greater trust to my country than I owe to him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, announces the appointment as members on the part of the Senate of the National Commission on Food Marketing, created by Senate Joint Resolution 71, the following Senators, namely, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MORTON), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA).

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) is in the Chamber; and we have discussed the problem presented to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Judiciary Committee in meeting tomorrow, in view of the time set for the beginning of the session of the Senate.

We have cleared this with those involved, and I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, not only is there no objection, but I also concur in the request of the Senator from Michigan and wish to confirm that there has been clearance on this matter with the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 6. An act to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10433. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. HART by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2972) for the relief of Dr. David J. Sencer, U.S. Public Health Service, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Comimttee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted two amendments (Nos. 1089 and 1090), intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted an amendment (No. 1091), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr JAVITS) submitted an amendment (No 1092), intended to be proposed by them jointly, to House bill 11049, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ELLENDER submitted amendment (No. 1093), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 11049, supra which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO IMPOSE A TAX ON ACQUISITIONS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SECURITIES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 1094

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendmen in the nature of a substitute, intended t be proposed by him, to the bill (H.I 8000) to amend the Internal Revenu Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acqu

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

of the bill lends adequate protection to civilian employees and eliminates certain inequities in the hiring of retired military persons.

The Civil Service Commission advises that section 205 is unnecessarily restrictive and strongly endorses the elimination of this provision.

Senate amendment No. 2 is a technical conforming amendment required by the elimination of section 205. It would renumber present section 206 to section 205.

Senate amendment No. 3 adds a new section 206 which would place certain ceilings on the amount of combined military retired pay and civilian compensation to be received by retired military personnel employed in a Federal civilian position.

The section would prescribe two ceilings:

First. In cases where the military retiree is employed in a civilian office with compensation determined under the Classification Act of 1949, the combined military retired pay and civilian compensation could not exceed the top rate of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Second. In cases where the civilian compensation is not determined under the Classification Act of 1949, the combined maximum rate could not exceed the rate of compensation recelved by the head of the department or agency.

The ceiling under the first rule measured by the top rate of the Classification Act would apply to retired members of any Regular component, but the ceiling under the second rule would apply to any retired member of any of the uniformed services.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the provision written in an attempt to eliminate the so-called buddy system still retained in the bill

Mr. HENDERSON. It definitely is. The gentleman well knows of my long interest in this. I have gone into this carefully. There have been no changes in this section as passed by the House.

Mr. GROSS. As far as I am concerned, this is one of the most important provisions of the bill and if it remains in it, I have no further questions concerning the conference report.

Mr. HENDERSON. I appreciate the gentleman's interest.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I believe the so-called buddy system should be eliminated. Just yesterday a young man came to my office who works for one of the departments of the Government. He told me that for several weeks now a given agency has been looking for a grade 13 man. It was not announced that the officials of the department were looking for the man. As soon as they found him, they then announced that the position was open, and the announcement closes quickly. That means that, to all intents and purposes, most people who might be qualified for the position are denied the opportunity of even knowing about the vacancy. This is wrong.

I also want to add this. I have introduced as of December 10, 1963, H.R. 9407 a bill that would if it should become law require reasonable notice on all examinations, where practical, and then genuine written examinations, where practical. I feel that this bill will be opposed, because selfish bureaucrats do not want that kind of thing. There are some people in our Government and outside our Government who believe the bill would be good legislation. The summer jobs program for students evidences some great injustices. We passed twice a bill here to bring about more fairness. There has been so much opposition to the legislation that the legislation has received little consideration in the other body. I say to you, though, that if we mean business when we say that we want effective and able Federal employees, we ought to go the full length in making it known that jobs are available and give true, worthwhile competitive examinations instead of what is known as complying with civil service standards, which are quite different to a true written competitive examination.

Mr. HENDERSON. The gentleman from Texas is to be commended for his longtime interest in this field. He well knows the provisions of this bill are a vast improvement over what he have had. As the gentleman from Iowa indicated, the provisions of this bill will go a long way toward eliminating the buddy system, as we refer to it. In the employment of retired former military personnel, this is a vast step forward in the improvement of the civil service employment procedures.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude with the further explanation of the amendments of the Senate.

The Civil Service Commission strongly objects to this amendment.

It would cause inequities and inconsistencies in the cases of those few retired members whose combined military retired pay and civilian compensation would be affected by these ceilings.

A retired regular member employed in the Department of Defense in a GS–18 Classification Act scientific position would have a salary reduced by the total amount of his retired pay; however, if he were employed to do exactly the same kind of work by the same agency under Public Law 313 which authorizes compensation to be fixed outside the Classification Act, the reduction in his salary would be insignificant, if any, because he could be paid as much as the Secretary of Defense—up to $35,000 under the new salary bill as passed by the Senate, H.R. 11049.

If the same individual were a Retired Reserve member, he would have no reduction in salary in the GS–18 position, but he could be subject to a reduction if he were employed under Public Law 313.

The provisions of section 206 would encourage all kinds of artificial arrangements to avoid the adverse maximum of the limits on particular individuals and groups, as indicated above.

Amendments Nos. 4 to 9 relate to employment in the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol. They are designed to continue the present employment policy of prohibiting any employee of those offices from receiving salary for more than one civilian office if the aggregate amount of basic compensation from such offices exceeds the sum of $2,000 per annum.

Amendment No. 8 provides that the limitation on dual compensation for more than one civilian office under section 301 of the bill shall not apply to persons employed under Public Law 87–82, relating to employees of the Architect of the Capitol in the Senate restaurants, or to employees employed under section 208 of Public Law 812 of the 76th Congress, relating to employees of the Architect of the Capitol in the House of Representatives restaurant.

The present law referred to in amendment No. 9 (2 U.S. C. 66a) prohibits dual compensation if one of the positions is in the U.S. Senate; however, one person may be employed in more than one part-time position in the House of Representatives if the basic compensation does not exceed $2,000 per annum.

Amendments Nos. 4 to 9 will retain the present dual employment rules, applicable to the employees of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 188]

Abbitt	Griffiths	Morrison
Alger	Hansen	Morton
Ashmore	Harris	Pilcher
Avery	Harvey, Mich.	Pool
Baring	Healey	Powell
Bass	Hébert	Pucinski
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman	Purcell
Blatnik	Holifield	Quie
Bolling	Hull	Randall
Brock	Jones, Ala.	Roberts, Ala.
Buckley	Kee	Roybal
Celler	Kilburn	Ryan, Mich.
Chelf	Kilgore	Senner
Davis, Tenn.	Knox	Skubitz
Diggs	Laird	Thomas
Dingell	Lankford	Thompson, La.
Evins	Lipscomb	Toll
Fino	Long, La.	Wallhauser
Flynt	Martin, Mass.	Wickersham
Gibbons	Miller, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Gill	Moore	
Gray	Moorhead	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 184. Joint resolution for the commemoration of the Honorable Herbert Hoover's 90th birthday, August 10, 1964.

EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIANS IN MORE THAN ONE POSITION AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the pay bill which was passed by this body and has now been passed by the other body.

I hope the Members of the House realize that in the version of the other body there is a provision which takes a direct slap at the members of the Supreme Court of the United States. This version would limit the raise of Supreme Court members to $2,500 instead of $7,500. I want to go on record as saying that no matter how anyone may feel about the actions of the Supreme Court in various instances, this is highly inappropriate. It certainly would be a severe blow to our whole system of government. We should, if we so desire, have the courage to take action on the basis of whatever we might want to do to review their decisions and take positive legislative action to do so. Certainly it is picayune, small, and unseemly to act as the other body proposes.

I hope that the conferees on our side, on the part of the House, will insist that the compensation of Justices of the Supreme Court be at the level at which passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10222) to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "economically needy" and insert: "low-income".

Page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike out "in economic need" and insert: "with low incomes".

Page 2, line 20, strike out all after "(b)" down to and including line 25 and insert: "The term 'food' means any food or food product for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco, those foods which are identified on the package as being imported, and meat and meat products which are imported."

Page 4, after line 20, insert:

"(b) In areas where a food stamp program is in effect, there shall be no distribution of federally owner foods to households under the authority of any other law except during emergency situations caused by a national or other disaster as determined by the Secretary.".

Page 4, line 21, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)".

Page 5, strike out lines 4 to 16, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 5. (a) Participation in the food stamp program shall be limited to those households whose income is determined to be a substantial limiting factor in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet."

"(b) In complying with the limitation on participation set forth in subsection (a) above, each State agency shall establish standards to determine the eligibility of applicant households. Such standards shall include maximum income limitations consistent with the income standards used by the State agency in administration of its federally aided public assistance programs. Such standards also shall place a limitation on the resources to be allowed eligible households. The standards of eligibility to be used by each State for the food stamp program shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary."

Page 6, line 17, after "a" insert "low-cost".

Page 11, line 8, after "required." insert "In approving the participation of the subdivisions requested by each State in its plan of operation, the Secretary shall provide for an equitable and orderly expansion among the several States in accordance with their relative need and readiness to meet their requested effective dates of participation."

Page 11, after line 19, insert:

"(g) If the Secretary determines that there has been gross negligence or fraud on the part of the State agency in the certification of applicant households, the State shall upon request of the Secretary deposit into the separate account authorized by section 7 of this Act, a sum equal to the amount by which the value of any coupons issued as a result of such negligence or fraud exceeds the amount that was charged for such coupons under section 7(b) of this Act."

Page 17, lines 11 and 12, strike out "not in excess of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964;".

Page 17, line 16, after "1967" insert "; and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year".

Page 18, line 2, after "section." insert "If in any fiscal year the Secretary finds that the requirements of participating States will exceed the limitation set forth herein, the Secretary shall direct State agencies to reduce the amount of such coupons to be issued to participating households to the extent necessary to comply with the provisions of this subsection."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among low-income households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman from North Carolina will advise the House as to the nature and the import of the Senate amendments.

Mr. COOLEY. I might say to my friend that the only one that is of great importance is what is known as the Miller amendment dealing with imported meats. I had anticipated that some question would be propounded concerning that, and I would like to place this matter before the House now.

The language in the bill clearly indicates that we do not intend for food stamps to be used to buy imported meat. We definitely do not want to do anything which would adversely affect the livestock industry of this country.

Not even by legislative history do we want to indicate that food stamps could not be used to buy meat products produced domestically, but certainly we do not intend to require retailers to maintain a private reporting service to warn them that they may be allowing customers to use food stamps to buy imported beef which may be commingled with domestic meats in processed foods. I understand that some foreign meats are used in processed foods. A recent report of the Tariff Commission indicates that a small amount of imported meat is sometimes used in frankfurters, bologna, luncheon meat, and canned products, but that on an average 80 percent of the meat used in these food articles is American-produced meat.

The definition "food" in this legislation would require to the extent practical that if the retailer knew he was offering imported meat for sale, he could not sell such meat for food coupons.

He could sell no food product that is labeled as imported on the package for food stamps.

He could not, for example, sell any meat product that is identified as being imported when he bought it—such as carcass beef or frozen block beef—no matter whether he ground it for ham-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JULY 23, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William C. Howland, Jr., pastor, the First Christian Church, Longview, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant this prayer may be more than mere fulfillment of expected ritual. In spirit and truth enable us to acknowledge that Thou alone art Creator, Sustainer, and Lord of life.

As Thou hast brought us to this moment by Thy providence, strengthen us with Thy power, making us glad with Thy presence.

We beseech Thy blessing on those who serve here, and the people and the country whom they seek to serve. Grant them ability equal to their opportunity, wisdom equal to their responsibility, and courage equal to their awesome task.

Through their labors give birth to insights which employed, can lead to full realization of good will among all men and peace among all Nations.

In Christ's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8313. An act to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, to convert credit unions incorporated under the provisions of the act to Federal credit unions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9833. An act granting a renewal of patent numbered D-162,975, relating to a medal of the American Legion; and

H.R. 9834. An act granting a renewal of patent numbered D-161,955, relating to a plaque of the American Legion.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 944. An act to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10300) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes."

EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIANS IN MORE THAN ONE POSITION AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7381), to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and consider the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 12, strike out lines 6 to 21, inclusive.

Page 12, line 22, strike out "206" and insert "205".

Page 12, after line 25, insert:

"SEC. 206. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no retired member of any regular component of the uniformed services who holds any civilian office the compensation for which is determined in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive salary for the performance of the duties of such civilian office at a rate which combined with the rate of retired or retirement pay received by him is in excess of the maximum rate authorized by such Classification Act of 1949, as amended; and no retired member of any of the uniformed services who holds any civilian office the compensation for which is not determined in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall receive salary for the performance of the duties of such civilian office at a rate which combined with the rate of retired or retirement pay received by him is in excess of the rate of salary received by the head of the department or agency by which he is employed."

Page 13, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 2 on page 14 and insert:

"(c) Unless otherwise authorized by law, no money appropriated by any Act shall be available for payment to any person of salary from more than one civilian office if the aggregate amount of the basic compensation from such offices exceeds the sum of $2,000 per annum, and if (1) one of such salaries is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives or (2) one of such offices is under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol."

Page 14, after line 17, insert:

"(5) compensation received by any person holding an office or position the compensation for which is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives or any office or position under the Architect of the Capitol;"

Page 14, line 18, strike out "(5)" and insert "(6)".

Page 14, line 21, strike out "(6)" and insert "(7)".

Page 16, after line 20, insert:

"(f) This title shall not be applicable to persons employed under the joint resolution approved July 6, 1961 (75 Stat. 199; Public Law 87-82), or under section 208 of the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941 (54 Stat. 1056; Public Law 812, 76th Congress)."

Page 34, after line 3, insert:

"(c) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify the provisions of the last paragraph under the heading 'Administrative Provisions' in the appropriations for the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 360; 2 U.S.C. 66a)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume that the gentleman from North Carolina will take a few minutes, at least, to explain what transpired in conference.

Mr. HENDERSON. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HENDERSON moves to concur in Senate amendments Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 and disagree to amendment No. 3.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 1 to H.R. 7381 eliminates section 205 which would require that before a retired member of any of the uniformed services may be appointed to a civilian office in the competitive civil service of any agency in the executive branch there must be public notice that a vacancy exists and that an assembled examination, where practicable open to all persons, is to be given. The vacancy could be filled only from among those qualified persons who successfully complete such examination.

The provision would require public notice, a waiting period, and open competitive examinations in order to fill any vacancy in the competitive civil service if a retired member of the Armed Forces is a candidate for the position. An agency could never positively determine whether a retired member would be interested in applying for such a position; consequently, the entire examining and appointing procedures of the Civil Service Commission would have to be revised in order to comply with the requirements of this section. It is felt that section 204

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

MASSACHUSETTS

Paul H. Benoit, Southbridge, Mass., in place of J. H. LeClair, retired.

MICHIGAN

James B. Koyne, Bellaire, Mich., in place of S. F. Blake, retired.

Richard K. Boomer, Lakeview, Mich., in place of M. C. Woodard, resigned.

John O. Boynton, Saint Ignace, Mich., in place of O. C. Boynton, Jr., retired.

MINNESOTA

Lawrence J. Mahan, Brandon, Minn., in place of W. H. Hoving, retired.

Violet L. Howard, Lyle, Minn., in place of O. J. Mortensen, declined.

MISSOURI

James G. Curry, Jr., Bucklin, Mo., in place of J. O. Finney, deceased.

Harold F. Taylor, Jonesburg, Mo., in place of C. J. Jones, retired.

MONTANA

Eugene Kennedy, Manhattan, Mont., in place of J. P. Waters, retired.

Sarah M. Riley, West Yellowstone, Mont., in place of A. E. Hansen, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Jeanne L. Tamplin, Hewitt, N.J., in place of M. F. Sando, retired.

No. 141——19

William L. Krieger, Maplewood, N.J., in place of O. V. McNany, resigned.

NEW YORK

Robert K. Baker, Argyle, N.Y., in place of A. C. Hall, retired.

Joseph F. Carrigan, East Rockaway, N.Y., in place of F. B. Crowley, retired.

Archie C. Raimondi, Glasco, N.Y., in place of Charles Riccardi, deceased.

Barbara A. Aikinburgh, Nelliston, N.Y., in place of J. W. Van Alstine, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Cora H. Gossmann, Arapaho, Okla., in place of E. E. Wiley, retired.

Carl B. Grimes, Elmer, Okla., in place of Velma McKinzie, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph J. Morris, Bryn Mawr, Pa., in place of M. C. Barone, transferred.

Raymond G. Mathews, Doylestown, Pa., in place of F. A. Fonash, retired.

William H. Couch, Greenville, Pa., in place of J. W. Reznor, retired.

Harvey A. Baddorf, Halifax, Pa., in place of R. R. Kinsinger, retired.

Alice M. Bustin, Milan, Pa., in place of A. G. Flood, retired.

Robert P. DeLotto, New Kensington, Pa., in place of A. G. Sullivan, retired.

Irving E. Rath, Pillow, Pa., in place of C. M. Koppenhaver, resigned.

Charles W. Plunkett, Turtlepoint, Pa., in place of G. L. Carlson, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Edwin L. Platts, Ridge Spring, S.C., in place of B. D. Boatwright, retired.

Warren L. Walkup, Timmonsville, S.C., in place of S. F. Harper, retired.

TENNESSEE

William B. Milstead, Hornsby, Tenn., in place of H. B. Milstead, retired.

James H. Miller, Surgoinsville, Tenn., in place of E. W. Marshall, retired.

TEXAS

Cloyce W. Floyd, Dawson, Tex., in place of C. D. Barry, retired.

Minna L. Squires, Eustace, Tex., in place of W. H. Wheeler, deceased.

Eunice B. Dayton, London, Tex., in place of Jessie Robinson, retired.

John M. Tidwell, Roanoke, Tex., in place of G. R. Jones, transferred.

Bernard G. Scrogin, Wallis, Tex., in place of A. H. Brandt, deceased.

VERMONT

Mary J. Reagan, Moretown, Vt., in place of M. B. Ward, retired.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

of the bill lends adequate protection to civilian employees and eliminates certain inequities in the hiring of retired military persons.

The Civil Service Commission advises that section 205 is unnecessarily restrictive and strongly endorses the elimination of this provision.

Senate amendment No. 2 is a technical conforming amendment required by the elimination of section 205. It would renumber present section 206 to section 205.

Senate amendment No. 3 adds a new section 206 which would place certain ceilings on the amount of combined military retired pay and civilian compensation to be received by retired military personnel employed in a Federal civilian position.

The section would prescribe two ceilings:

First. In cases where the military retiree is employed in a civilian office with compensation determined under the Classification Act of 1949, the combined military retired pay and civilian compensation could not exceed the top rate of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Second. In cases where the civilian compensation is not determined under the Classification Act of 1949, the combined maximum rate could not exceed the rate of compensation received by the head of the department or agency.

The ceiling under the first rule measured by the top rate of the Classification Act would apply to retired members of any Regular component, but the ceiling under the second rule would apply to any retired member of any of the uniformed services.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the provision written in an attempt to eliminate the so-called buddy system still retained in the bill

Mr. HENDERSON. It definitely is. The gentleman well knows of my long interest in this. I have gone into this carefully. There have been no changes in this section as passed by the House.

Mr. GROSS. As far as I am concerned, this is one of the most important provisions of the bill and if it remains in it, I have no further questions concerning the conference report.

Mr. HENDERSON. I appreciate the gentleman's interest.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I believe the so-called buddy system should be eliminated. Just yesterday a young man came to my office who works for one of the departments of the Government. He told me that for several weeks now a given agency has been looking for a grade 13 man. It was not announced that the officials of the department were looking for the man. As soon as they found him, they then announced that the position was open, and the announcement closes quickly. That means that, to all intents and purposes, most people who might be qualified for the position are denied the opportunity of even knowing about the vacancy. This is wrong.

I also want to add this. I have introduced as of December 10, 1963, H.R. 9407 a bill that would if it should become law require reasonable notice on all examinations, where practical, and then genuine written examinations, where practical. I feel that this bill will be opposed, because selfish bureaucrats do not want that kind of thing. There are some people in our Government and outside our Government who believe the bill would be good legislation. The summer jobs program for students evidences some great injustices. We passed twice a bill here to bring about more fairness. There has been so much opposition to the legislation that the legislation has received little consideration in the other body. I say to you, though, that if we mean business when we say that we want effective and able Federal employees, we ought to go the full length in making it known that jobs are available and give true, worthwhile competitive examinations instead of what is known as complying with civil service standards, which are quite different to a true written competitive examination.

Mr. HENDERSON. The gentleman from Texas is to be commended for his longtime interest in this field. He well knows the provisions of this bill are a vast improvement over what he have had. As the gentleman from Iowa indicated, the provisions of this bill will go a long way toward eliminating the buddy system, as we refer to it. In the employment of retired former military personnel, this is a vast step forward in the improvement of the civil service employment procedures.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude with the further explanation of the amendments of the Senate.

The Civil Service Commission strongly objects to this amendment.

It would cause inequities and inconsistencies in the cases of those few retired members whose combined military retired pay and civilian compensation would be affected by these ceilings.

A retired regular member employed in the Department of Defense in a GS–18 Classification Act scientific position would have a salary reduced by the total amount of his retired pay; however, if he were employed to do exactly the same kind of work by the same agency under Public Law 313 which authorizes compensation to be fixed outside the Classification Act, the reduction in his salary would be insignificant, if any, because he could be paid as much as the Secretary of Defense—up to $35,000 under the new salary bill as passed by the Senate, H.R. 11049.

If the same individual were a Retired Reserve member, he would have no reduction in salary in the GS–18 position, but he could be subject to a reduction if he were employed under Public Law 313.

The provisions of section 206 would encourage all kinds of artificial arrangements to avoid the adverse maximum of the limits on particular individuals and groups, as indicated above.

Amendments Nos. 4 to 9 relate to employment in the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol. They are designed to continue the present employment policy of prohibiting any employee of those offices from receiving salary for more than one civilian office if the aggregate amount of basic compensation from such offices exceeds the sum of $2,000 per annum.

Amendment No. 8 provides that the limitation on dual compensation for more than one civilian office under section 301 of the bill shall not apply to persons employed under Public Law 87–82, relating to employees of the Architect of the Capitol in the Senate restaurants, or to employees employed under section 208 of Public Law 812 of the 76th Congress, relating to employees of the Architect of the Capitol in the House of Representatives restaurant.

The present law referred to in amendment No. 9 (2 U.S. C. 66a) prohibits dual compensation if one of the positions is in the U.S. Senate; however, one person may be employed in more than one part-time position in the House of Representatives if the basic compensation does not exceed $2,000 per annum.

Amendments Nos. 4 to 9 will retain the present dual employment rules, applicable to the employees of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 188]

Abbitt	Griffiths	Morrison
Alger	Hansen	Morton
Ashmore	Harris	Pilcher
Avery	Harvey, Mich.	Pool
Baring	Healey	Powell
Bass	Hébert	Pucinski
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman	Purcell
Blatnik	Holifield	Quie
Bolling	Hull	Randall
Brock	Jones, Ala.	Roberts, Ala.
Buckley	Kee	Roybal
Celler	Kilburn	Ryan, Mich.
Chelf	Kilgore	Senner
Davis, Tenn.	Knox	Skubitz
Diggs	Laird	Thomas
Dingell	Lankford	Thompson, La.
Evins	Lipscomb	Toll
Fino	Long, La.	Wallhauser
Flynt	Martin, Mass.	Wickersham
Gibbons	Miller, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Gill	Moore	
Gray	Moorhead	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 184. Joint resolution for the commemoration of the Honorable Herbert Hoover's 90th birthday, August 10, 1964.

EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIANS IN MORE THAN ONE POSITION AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the pay bill which was passed by this body and has now been passed by the other body.

I hope the Members of the House realize that in the version of the other body there is a provision which takes a direct slap at the members of the Supreme Court of the United States. This version would limit the raise of Supreme Court members to $2,500 instead of $7,500. I want to go on record as saying that no matter how anyone may feel about the actions of the Supreme Court in various instances, this is highly inappropriate. It certainly would be a severe blow to our whole system of government. We should, if we so desire, have the courage to take action on the basis of whatever we might want to do to review their decisions and take positive legislative action to do so. Certainly it is picayune, small, and unseemly to act as the other body proposes.

I hope that the conferees on our side, on the part of the House, will insist that the compensation of Justices of the Supreme Court be at the level at which passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10222) to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "economically needy" and insert: "low-income".

Page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike out "in economic need" and insert: "with low incomes".

Page 2, line 20, strike out all after "(b)" down to and including line 25 and insert: "The term 'food' means any food or food product for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco, those foods which are identified on the package as being imported, and meat and meat products which are imported."

Page 4, after line 20, insert:

"(b) In areas where a food stamp program is in effect, there shall be no distribution of federally owner foods to households under the authority of any other law except during emergency situations caused by a national or other disaster as determined by the Secretary.".

Page 4, line 21, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)".

Page 5, strike out lines 4 to 16, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 5. (a) Participation in the food stamp program shall be limited to those households whose income is determined to be a substantial limiting factor in the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet."

"(b) In complying with the limitation on participation set forth in subsection (a) above, each State agency shall establish standards to determine the eligibility of applicant households. Such standards shall include maximum income limitations consistent with the income standards used by the State agency in administration of its federally aided public assistance programs. Such standards also shall place a limitation on the resources to be allowed eligible households. The standards of eligibility to be used by each State for the food stamp program shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary."

Page 6, line 17, after "a" insert "low-cost".

Page 11, line 8, after "required." insert "In approving the participation of the subdivisions requested by each State in its plan of operation, the Secretary shall provide for an equitable and orderly expansion among the several States in accordance with their relative need and readiness to meet their requested effective dates of participation."

Page 11, after line 19, insert:

"(g) If the Secretary determines that there has been gross negligence or fraud on the part of the State agency in the certification of applicant households, the State shall upon request of the Secretary deposit into the separate account authorized by section 7 of this Act, a sum equal to the amount by which the value of any coupons issued as a result of such negligence or fraud exceeds the amount that was charged for such coupons under section 7(b) of this Act."

Page 17, lines 11 and 12, strike out "not in excess of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964;".

Page 17, line 16, after "1967" insert "; and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year".

Page 18, line 2, after "section." insert "If in any fiscal year the Secretary finds that the requirements of participating States will exceed the limitation set forth herein, the Secretary shall direct State agencies to reduce the amount of such coupons to be issued to participating households to the extent necessary to comply with the provisions of this subsection."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among low-income households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman from North Carolina will advise the House as to the nature and the import of the Senate amendments.

Mr. COOLEY. I might say to my friend that the only one that is of great importance is what is known as the Miller amendment dealing with imported meats. I had anticipated that some question would be propounded concerning that, and I would like to place this matter before the House now.

The language in the bill clearly indicates that we do not intend for food stamps to be used to buy imported meat. We definitely do not want to do anything which would adversely affect the livestock industry of this country.

Not even by legislative history do we want to indicate that food stamps could not be used to buy meat products produced domestically, but certainly we do not intend to require retailers to maintain a private reporting service to warn them that they may be allowing customers to use food stamps to buy imported beef which may be commingled with domestic meats in processed foods. I understand that some foreign meats are used in processed foods. A recent report of the Tariff Commission indicates that a small amount of imported meat is sometimes used in frankfurters, bologna, luncheon meat, and canned products, but that on an average 80 percent of the meat used in these food articles is American-produced meat.

The definition "food" in this legislation would require to the extent practical that if the retailer knew he was offering imported meat for sale, he could not sell such meat for food coupons.

He could sell no food product that is labeled as imported on the package for food stamps.

He could not, for example, sell any meat product that is identified as being imported when he bought it—such as carcass beef or frozen block beef—no matter whether he ground it for ham-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

History will be kind to much of what has happened here. Needless to say, more has happened here to give the citizens of this country, yes even of the world, a more abundant and peaceful life.

As one who has a deep and abiding interest in history and who reflects on it often, I recommend to the senators in our presence that their study of history never cease. There are important lessons to be learned from history. Proper study of history can help us avoid the mistakes of the past.

So I say to you of Girls Nation, watch carefully, study diligently, and absorb well what you witness here today. Maintain your interest and perhaps someday you will take a seat down here on this floor as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DONNA L. TUSSING, PRESIDENT OF GIRLS NATION

(Mr. McINTIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I feel highly privileged and proud to advise this body that Donna L. Tussing of Brewer, Maine, Second Congressional District of Maine, yesterday was elected president of the Girls Nation. Girls Nation is, as we know, a culmination of Girls State, and is the wonderful youth citizenship training program conducted annually by the American Legion auxiliary to give high school juniors practical experience in the processes of government.

Donna was born in Island Falls, Maine, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Tussing, now of Eddington, Maine. She is 17 years of age and is in the class of 1965 at the Brewer High School. She is an active participant in comunity activities, and in her school program she takes a leading part in debating and basketball. Donna is also a member of the national honor society.

She is one of four children, having two brothers, James, 13, and Philip, 9 years of age. She also has a 16-year-old sister, Susan.

Donna's father is a long-time employee of the Soil Conservation Service in Maine, and presently he is employed in conservation work in Penobscot County.

Donna Tussing has every reason to be eminently proud, for this is the first time that the presidential office of Girls Nation has come to a representative from Maine. All Maine is indeed proud and applauds Donna's attainment.

The Maine congressional delegation extends hearty congratulations to Donna on her very fine achievement—it is indeed a high honor to serve as the head of an organization with those high ideals that are the standard of Girls Nation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 191]

Alger	Hawkins	Passman
Avery	Healey	Pepper
Baker	Hébert	Pilcher
Baring	Horton	Powell
Bass	Jarman	Sheppard
Bennett, Mich.	Kee	Slack
Buckley	Kilburn	Steed
Celler	Kilgore	Teague, Tex.
Clausen, Don H.	Lankford	Thompson, La.
	Lesinski	Toll
Davis, Tenn.	Lloyd	Van Pelt
Duncan	Long, Md.	Wallhauser
Edmondson	Morris	Wickersham
Evins	Norblad	Williams
Harris	Ostertag	Willis

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SISK). On this rollcall 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Mr. BECKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident now to everyone that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary does not intend and will not bring in a resolution to amend the Constitution to permit prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. I have this word from members of the Committee on the Judiciary. Therefore, Discharge Petition No. 3 is at the desk. We need less than 50 signatures now in order to bring this to the 218 required.

There were Members on the floor here earlier complimenting the American Legion for the operation of Girls Nation and Boys Nation. While they are complimenting the American Legion these Members should sign the petition, because the American Legion has at two national conventions endorsed prayer and Bible reading in the public schools, and every Member is aware of this.

Our Lord states, "Suffer ye little children to come unto Me," but the Supreme Court says "not in public schools." But we have the opportunity here at this session to correct this. I think this, being the greatest issue in the country, it should be done now.

THE LATE DR. THOMAS HENRY CARROLL II

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker it is with a sense of personal sadness that I call to the attention of the House the untimely death of Dr. Thomas Henry Carroll II, the 13th president of the George Washington University of Washington, D.C. The death of this great educator brings to an end the astounding career of a man deeply devoted to educational ideals and to the aims of public service. His interest in joining together a knowledge of public affairs, along with studies of business and government, has brought new and vital ideas to the George Washington University. President Carroll, by his able administrative leadership and his high academic standards, leaves a legacy that long should challenge the Gerge Washington University which he served so brilliantly and so willingly.

The entire educational community mourns the loss of Dr. Carroll. To his beloved wife and family I extend the deepest sympathy of both Mrs. McCormack and myself.

LOSS OF A LEADER

George Washington University, the local community and in a broad sense the cause of higher education share a grievous loss in the death of Thomas H. Carroll. Its untimeliness adds a poignant touch of tragedy.

He was still a young man, at the outset of a new career. His ceaseless energy and a singularly infectious enthusiasm were only beginning to unfold to others and to enlist their determined support in realizing the visions he saw for the university's future.

In the brief 3 years since his inauguration as George Washington University's 13th president he had completed the groundwork and the outline of foundations to support the sort of structure his own dedication to purpose made evident to others as a practical, necessary, and attainable objective. He had won the confidence of a faculty and student body which found in him a champion of their interests in his insistence on academic excellence and of a board of trustees to which his personality and aspirations were attracting added national representation. He had won ready acceptance by the community as one who seemed destined for constructive leadership.

He leaves for others the pursuit and achievement of high aims that will not be abandoned but which seemed more readily accessible under his inspirational, dynamic guidance.

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OR BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 803, Rept. No. 1630) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of the basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same hereby is taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby disagreed to, and that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses be, and the same is hereby agreed to.

THE POVERTY BILL

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 806, Rept. No. 1631) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11377) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

the United States. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed six hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of the bill H.R. 11377, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2642 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 11377 as passed by the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the rule carry a motion to recommit with instructions?

The SPEAKER. The answer of the Chair is that if the proposed rule is adopted such a motion will be in order.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the Chair.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 189, page 16630 of the RECORD, I am recorded as being absent. I was present, and answered to my name, and I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSE TRAILERS AND MOBILE DWELLINGS OF MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8954) to amend section 409 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the transportation of house trailers and mobile dwellings of members of the uniformed services within the continental United States, within Alaska, or between the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 409 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 409. Travel and transportation allowances: trailers

"'Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned and in place of the transportation of baggage and household effects or payment of a dislocation allowance, a member, or in the case of his death his dependent, who would otherwise be entitled to transportation of baggage, and household goods under section 406 of this title, may transport a house trailer or mobile dwelling within the continental United States, within Alaska, or between the continental United States and Alaska, for use as a residence by one of the following means—

"'(1) transport the trailer or dwelling and receive a monetary allowance in place of transportation at a rate to be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, but not more than 20 cents a mile;

"'(2) deliver the trailer or dwelling to an agent of the United States for transportation by the United States or by commercial means; or

"'(3) transport the trailer or dwelling by commercial means and be reimbursed by the United States subject to such rates as may be prescribed by the Secretaries concerned.

However, the cost of transportation under clause (2) or the reimbursement under clause (3) may not be more than the lesser of (A) the current average cost for the commercial transportation of a house trailer or mobile dwelling; (B) 51 cents a mile; or (C) the cost of transporting the baggage and household effects of the member or his dependent plus the dislocation allowance authorized in section 407 of this title. Any payment authorized by this section may be made in advance of the transportation concerned. For the purposes of this section, 'continental United States" means the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 8954, with the Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The amendment by the Senate provides a new ceiling on the maximum amount which may be paid for the commercial transportation of mobile homes owned by military personnel on permanent change of station.

The Senate ceiling is established at 51 cents per mile as contrasted to the House ceiling which provided that reimbursement was to be actual cost provided that such cost did not exceed what it would otherwise cost to move the household effects of the member, plus the dislocation allowance to which he would be entitled.

Under existing law, the maximum amount payable on a trailer move is 36 cents per mile.

The bill as passed by the House would result in increased annual transportation costs of approximately $1,246,000.

The bill as passed by the Senate, which provides a lower ceiling on these costs, would result in increased annual transportation costs of approximately $1,075,000, a reduction of approximately $179,000 from the House bill.

Although the bill as amended by the Senate is not as generous as the House-passed bill, I have been authorized by the Committee on Armed Services to request House approval of the Senate amendment on H.R. 8954 since it does provide an assured and substantial increase in the trailer allowances for military mobile home owners from the present maximum of 36 cents to a new maximum of 51 cents a mile.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1964

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 802), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11865) to increase benefits under the Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the Trust Funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed five hours, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and at the conclusion of my remarks, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 802 provides for consideration of H.R. 11865, a bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes. The resolution provides a closed rule, waiving points of order, with 5 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 11865 is to improve the benefit and coverage provisions and the financing structure of the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system.

The last across-the-board adjustment in social security insurance benefits, and the last adjustment in the amount of annual earnings that is taxed and credit-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Passage, by a 72-to-15 vote Tuesday last by the other body confirmed this story. Now the pressure is on to kill the proposal in the House. As a matter of fact, I understand that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman was up here on the Hill last night conferring with the Democratic leadership. I think the House ought to know what this visit was all about.

The administration hopes to avoid the embarrassment of a veto, enabling President Johnson to maintain the agreement giving New Zealand and Australia a big share of American beef markets, a big share of our beef imports.

It seems logical to me that if the Senate overwhelmingly voted for the limitation of foreign meat imports, by a 57-vote margin, then certainly the proposal should come before the House of Representatives for a vote.

I, for one, will look with great interest to see what is going to happen in the next few days.

IMPORT QUOTAS ON BEEF

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time because what the gentleman has just said is news to me. I want to advise the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] that his statement about Mr. Freeman's conferring with the Democratic leadership is news to me. I did not know anything about such a meeting.

THE LATE SENATOR CLAIR ENGLE

(Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is with a heavy heart that I notify you of the death of your friend and mine, Senator CLAIR ENGLE, who passed away this morning at 3:10 in his home on New Jersey Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, CLAIR was a very dear friend of mine. I succeeded him in the congressional district which he represented at the time of his election to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Speaker, CLAIR ENGLE was an untiring worker for our district, the State of California and the Nation.

I know of no other person in our district of whom the people thought more and held in higher esteem.

Mr. Speaker, CLAIR was elected by the votes of both Republicans and Democrats. He enjoyed a very distinguished career in this House. He had just completed 6 years of service in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Speaker, CLAIR ENGLE will be missed by all of us in California and I am sure by many of us here in the House of Representatives who were his very good friends as a result of his 16 years of service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Engle and their daughter Yvonne in this great loss.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 194]

Alger	Harsha	Passman
Ashmore	Healey	Pepper
Avery	Hébert	Pilcher
Baring	Hull	Powell
Barrett	Johnson, Pa.	Rains
Bass	Jones, Mo.	Ryan, Mich.
Bennett, Mich.	Kee	Sheppard
Bolling	Kilburn	Slack
Brock	Kirwan	Toll
Buckley	Lankford	Tupper
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Van Pelt
Dawson	Lloyd	Vinson
Diggs	McIntire	Wallhauser
Duncan	MacGregor	Willis
Evins	Miller, N.Y.	Winstead
Harris	Norblad	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 387 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RELATING TO H.R. 11049

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 803 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same hereby is taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby disagreed to, and that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses be, and the same is hereby agreed to.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 803 simply provides for H.R. 11049 to go to conference. The situation regarding the pay bill dealing with the executve, legislative, judicial, civil service, and postal employees was objected to at the time that a request was made to disagree to the Senate amendment and to ask for a confernce. As a result, it was referred to the Committee on Rules, and we here today present a resolution as the Clerk has read.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we can expeditiously act upon this resolution to permit the conferees on the part of the House to sit down with the conferees on the part of the other body to discuss the differences that exist between the pay raise bills within the two Houses and then report back, at which time of course, the House will have an opportunity either to accept or to reject the action of the conferees.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thought that according to some of the newspapers the members of the Democrat delegation from California were going to be opposed to this bill unless the Senate increased the salary of Members of Congress by $10,000. The Senate left the increase at $7,500. I fully anticipated that there would be strong objection to this bill from the Democrat Members of the House in view of the publicity I read in the newspapers.

The gentleman says he wants to handle this matter expeditiously. Apparently there is not going to be any opposition from the California Democrats.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, of course I am not here delegated to speak for the California delegation or for any part of the California delegation. But I will say this, speaking for the Member now on the floor, that at the time the original pay raise bill came out I was a strong supporter of the increases provided in the first bill. I happened to handle the rule at the time that bill was before the House. I supported it very vigorously at that time. The bill, as my good friend from Iowa knows, was defeated in spite of the fact that I voted for it.

We have back here again another bill of somewhat different nature with lesser increases in some instances and more increases in others. But, having studied the art of compromise as I know my friend from Iowa sometimes finds himself confronted with, I think now is the time to permit our conferees from the two bodies to sit down and see what we can work out. Then our positions, mine as well as the positions of other Members of the House, will be expressed at the time the conference report is brought back to the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will my friend from California yield?

Mr. SISK. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa seldom if ever gets compromised to the point of not objecting to a bill that he feels constrained to object to.

Mr. SISK. I agree with the gentleman. I think the gentleman properly made an objection to this bill going to conference, giving us an opportunity here at least to talk about it and to discuss with our conferees what their attitude might be. I, for one, have no criticism at all of the objection which the gentleman made, rightfully, in line with the parliamentary procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution and reserve the balance of my time.

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply provides that upon its adoption, there shall be taken from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 11049, the so-called pay increase bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and send the bill to conference. There will be only one vote, and that is on the adoption of the resolution.

H.R. 11049 itself was a controversial measure. It was approved by this House. A similar bill was defeated in March, as I recall. This bill was approved by the House, was sent to the other body, and amended over there. There are considerable differences between the House bill and the measure as it was amended by the Senate.

As the bill cleared the House it, in my opinion, gave a little too much of a break, too much consideration, to those Government employees, officials, or appointees in the higher brackets of income, and did not give sufficient consideration to those Government workers, postal workers, and classified employees of the Federal Government, in the lower brackets of income.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the amendments adopted in the other body, certain increases are now included in the bill as it came here for consideration of the Senate amendments so as to give, or it does give, greater consideration and greater pay increases, or a higher percentage of pay increases—to the lower-paid employees and workers in the Federal Government, and not quite so much of the so-called gravy to some of the higher paid officials of our Government, including, by the way, certain Federal Court officials who seemingly are more engaged these days in legislative work than in judicial work.

Mr. Speaker, I hope when this bill goes to conference careful attention will be given to these differences and that when the bill comes back to the House from the conference committee, it will contain some of the amendments adopted in the other body just a little more fair to the lower income groups among our Federal employees than provided in the original House bill, and not quite so liberal an arrangement as the House bill provisions for increasing the pay of some of the higher paid appointees and officials of the Federal Government who now seem to be doing pretty well here in Washington, none of whom are seemingly anxious to leave their present positions because of any feeling their compensation is entirely too low.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this resolution should be adopted so this matter can follow the usual procedure, or legislative course of going to conference, being considered by the conference committee, and brought back to the House in the form of a conference committee report. The House itself can then pass upon any of the amendments, or any of the changes, that may be made in the bill by the conference committee itself.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment to point out that I understand both the House and the Senate bills contain an increase for Members of Congress of, not $10,000, as had been requested by some groups here in the House, but of $7,500 per annum. In view of the fact this provision is not in dispute—that item in the bill will not be subject to consideration by the conference committee.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute in order to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. May I compliment the gentleman on his good statement.

I would like to point out to the Members of the House, to those of us who are conservative Members of the House, that this bill calls for a cost-of-living increase and adjustment of pay rates on a fair and equitable basis.

This bill should be sent to conference to work out the small differences between the Senate and the House versions of the legislation.

This pay raise legislation will make for good, efficient, and economical Government service voluntarily given by employees who feel that we in Congress are interested in their welfare and that of their families.

Therefore, I would suggest to my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that in order to be conservative we should all be constrained to vote for this rule and send the bill to conference.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and the other Members of the House that even at the best, as I understand this bill, it will cost about $550 million yearly. That will be the cost tag placed upon the measure, and the price which will have to be paid by the taxpayers of the United States once this bill becomes law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has a great deal more faith I think than anyone else in the House of Representatives as to the results of the conference on this bill. It is an event when a conference of the House and Senate cuts spending on almost any bill.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution ought to be defeated. I am opposed to this pay increase bill, and if the gentleman from Pennsylvania is opposed he will vote against the resolution as will everyone else who is opposed to a pay increase. Why send it to conference? Let it be defeated here and now.

However, I labor under no illusion as to what will likely happen here today because the rubberstamp is in operation, and it has been since the House back in March, by a 38-vote margin, defeated a pay increase bill in a direct confrontation on the issue. Then the legislation was resurrected and, as the gentleman from Ohio has well said, and despite minor amendments on the part of the other body, this bill authorizes the spending of more than a half-billion a year on salary increases. Members of the House are going to participate in a 33⅓-percent increase, no matter how thick or how thin you try to slice it, if you vote for this bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. The gentleman mentioned that Members of the House will be voting at least a 33⅓-percent increase. I want to say it is my understanding if this bill passes in either form we will be voting to pay Members of Congress, of the 89th Congress, who are here next January. The new rate of pay, I believe, will be something like $30,000 after January 1. I do not know how many of us will be in the Congress next year, but I think it is well to bring that out. The original bill and the present bill provide for the Members of the 89th Congress, the Members who serve in that Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure it will be good news to the Republican opponent of the gentleman from California to know that he does not expect to come back in January.

Mr. SISK. I might say it apparently is true that my Republican opponent in California is an avid reader of the RECORD, but I did not infer I was not desirous personally to be back. We will have that little discussion out there, however, in the next few months.

Mr. GROSS. There will be a good deal of discussion on this and related aspects in the gentleman's district, and in my own district.

Mr. Speaker, once again I warn that approval of this irresponsible pay legislation will stimulate another wage and price spiral across the country and feed the flames of inflation.

In this connection I call attention to a statement made by President Johnson at Atlantic City last March at which time he said:

> We must not choke off our needed and speedy economic expansion by a revival of the price-wage spiraling. Avoiding that spiral is the responsibility of business, and it is also the responsibility of labor.

Since Lyndon Johnson is applying heavy pressure in support of this salary grab, I assume that any statement he may make at the Democrat National Convention in Atlantic City in August will be just as meaningless as the one I just read and which emanated from the same place, Atlantic City, last March.

It is impossible for me to comprehend how a President of the United States can call on business and industry to hold the wage-price line and at the same time beat Members of Congress over the back to support a pay increase bill that will cost well above a half billion dollars a year. And it is impossible for me to comprehend how Members of Congress can yield to this pressure and boost their own salaries 33 percent when they know that the money to pay their increases and others will have to be borrowed, thus adding to the already staggering debt and deficit.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. Speaker, I again call attention to the fact that the Federal employees retirement fund is $34 billion in the red, and that this bill, increasing salaries, will only compound that deficit.

Incidentally, I understand that conferees on this bill have already met even though they have not been so designated by the Speaker. So perhaps this is an exercise in futility here today. Perhaps the time devoted to this bill now and the time devoted to an official conference would have been better spent on the so-called poverty legislation that is to follow.

This is quite a demonstration you are giving the people of this Nation today, promoting a salary-increase bill, and then coming to the floor, probably next week or at a very early date, with a war-on-poverty bill. I wonder what the public is going to think about a Congress that votes itself handsome pay increases and the same for Federal judges and Justices of the Supreme Court who pay nothing into the retirement fund and have lifetime jobs. Incidentally, where is the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court today who is scheduled to get an $8,000-a-year pay increase? He is off enjoying a vacation in Europe while the report on the assassination of the late President Kennedy, which was supposed to have been made on June 1, we are now told may be made by the middle of September. I am sure everyone is anxious to give the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who is the chairman of an investigating committee, an $8,000-a-year increase so that he can enjoy a vacation when he is supposed to be here doing his work.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a billion and a half dollars. Today a half billion dollars. Next week another billion dollars—this time to end poverty.

And so we go merrily and irresponsibly on our way to more permanently incurred obligations, to more deficit financing, to still higher national debt, to more interest charges on that debt, and to more borrowing to pay for the pyramiding cost of borrowing.

This is not the occasion to discuss the details of the Federal pay bill.

Suffice to say at this point that in advancing this bill one step toward final enactment we are repeating today the offense we committed yesterday.

Yesterday with respect to the social security amendments we undertook to offset the consequences of inflation by involving the social security program more deeply in the processes of inflation.

Today it is proposed we do the same thing with respect to the compensation of Federal employees, and we compound the offense by including unconscionable salary increases for Members of Congress and the Federal judiciary and for top officials of the executive branch.

On the pretext of undertaking to offset the effects of inflation in the area of Federal compensation, we are proposing to involve the Federal salary and wage system even more deeply in the processes of inflation.

I urge the defeat of this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, the subject before us is a simple matter of whether or not we are going to allow the majority of the House and Senate to work its will on this bill. The House passed this bill 243 to 157; that is 61 percent to 39 percent. The Senate passed the bill by 58 to 21, which is 73 to 27 percent.

We have been fooling around with this bill since it was first suggested in May of 1963. We ran into one obstruction after another, not the least of which was objection to even going to conference.

All that they have succeeded in doing by this tactic is to waste time. The merits of the bill are not under consideration and cannot be in the time that is available to us.

I want to note in contrast that the military pay raise bill was introduced in the other body and passed by the committee and passed by the other body and has been reported out by the committee here in less than 1 month. It is the second military pay raise in recent years. We will probably be voting on it soon.

But the simple resolution before this body today is, I repeat, whether or not a majority of the House and of the Senate are to be allowed to be represented in a conference committee meeting to work out the differences in a bill which has been agreed on and which has been budgeted for.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution and urge that we get on with our business.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, made some remarks regarding the position of the California delegation and of the particular Member here discussing the matter, and particularly with reference to who would receive these increases. As I understand, the gentleman from Iowa seeks reelection to the next Congress, as I am seeking reelection, and I am just a bit curious, assuming that this legislation passes, as to whether the gentleman proposes to accept his salary increase next year assuming that he is a Member of the 89th Congress. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for his answer.

Mr. GROSS. In view of what the gentleman said a little while ago, and the fact that he apparently will have a campaign in his district, I was giving some slight consideration to turning over my share of the increase to his campaign. I doubt that I will do it, but I was giving it consideration. I think the gentleman is going to need help.

Mr. SISK. Let me say to my good friend that I appreciate the generosity of that gesture and I hope he goes through with it. I am more than happy to receive any campaign funds that are given in good ethics because I think we can do a good job out in California. I understand that recently my potential opponent out there inherited some help which I do not think he is too happy about, but anyway he is going to be on the ticket and running with the gentleman's candidate for President. I think we will have an interesting campaign this fall. Of course, if the gentleman can make a contribution to my campaign, it is more than welcome.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure that after the Democrat convention there will be a lot of changing of minds on your side of the aisle about some of the spending that is going on because I am sure the President is going to go over to Atlantic City and repeat what he said last March. I did not believe he meant it at that time, but he may mean it sometime—I do not know. I have a hard time keeping up with him on what he means.

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman from Iowa will permit me to say so, you know I served for some 6 years as a Member of the Congress under the gentleman's President, President Eisenhower. I think President Eisenhower's position was not very clear and sometimes I did not know quite what his position was on certain issues. I did the best I could to follow him. I think my good friend will agree with me that it was not an easy time, so I think in the final analysis this thing will all work out and we will wait and see what happens in Atlantic City.

Mr. GROSS. You are going to have a plank in your platform against inflation and spiraling of wages; are you not?

Mr. SISK. Oh, I am sure about that.

But the gentleman failed to answer my question, assuming that we are both back here as Members of the 89th Congress, whether he will accept his salary increase.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman let me cogitate on that for a little while, at least until we see what happens?

Mr. SISK. We hope to be together to discuss this in early January.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution and move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 244, nays 131, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

YEAS—244

Addabbo	Auchincloss	Blatnik
Albert	Barrett	Boggs
Anderson	Barry	Boland
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bates	Bolton, Frances P.
Ashley	Becker	Bolton, Oliver P.
Aspinall	Beckworth	
	Bell	

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Bonner	Hansen	Ostertag
Bow	Harding	Patman
Brooks	Hardy	Patten
Broomfield	Harrison	Pelly
Brown, Calif.	Hawkins	Pepper
Brown, Ohio	Hays	Philbin
Broyhill, Va.	Healey	Pike
Burke	Henderson	Pirnie
Burkhalter	Herlong	Pool
Burton, Calif.	Hoffman	Powell
Byrne, Pa.	Holland	Price
Byrnes, Wis.	Horton	Pucinski
Cahill	Hosmer	Purcell
Cameron	Ichord	Reid, N.Y.
Carey	Joelson	Reuss
Casey	Johnson, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.
Cederberg	Johnson, Pa.	Riehlman
Celler	Johnson, Wis.	Rivers, Alaska
Clausen, Don H.	Karsten	Robison
	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Cohelan	Keith	Rogers, Colo.
Conte	Kelly	Rooney, N.Y.
Cooley	Kilgore	Rooney, Pa.
Corbett	King, Calif.	Roosevelt
Corman	King, N.Y.	Rosenthal
Daddario	Kirwan	Rostenkowski
Daniels	Kluczynski	Roush
Davis, Ga.	Kornegay	Roybal
Delaney	Kunkel	Ryan, N.Y.
Dent	Laird	St Germain
Denton	Libonati	St. Onge
Derounian	Lindsay	Schwengel
Diggs	Lipscomb	Scott
Dingell	Long, La.	Senner
Donohue	Long, Md.	Sheppard
Downing	McCulloch	Shipley
Dulski	McDade	Sibal
Dwyer	McDowell	Sickles
Edmondson	McFall	Sisk
Edwards	McLoskey	Smith, Calif.
Elliott	McMillan	Smith, Iowa
Ellsworth	Macdonald	Stafford
Fallon	Madden	Staggers
Farbstein	Mahon	Steed
Fascell	Mailliard	Stephens
Feighan	Martin, Mass.	Stratton
Finnegan	Mathias	Sullivan
Fino	Matsunaga	Talcott
Flood	Matthews	Taylor
Flynt	Michel	Teague, Calif.
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	Thomas
Fraser	Milliken	Thompson, N.J.
Friedel	Minish	Thompson, Tex.
Fulton, Pa.	Monagan	Tollefson
Fuqua	Montoya	Trimble
Gallagher	Moore	Tuten
Garmatz	Moorhead	Udall
Gary	Morgan	Ullman
Giaimo	Morris	Van Deerlin
Gibbons	Morrison	Vanik
Gilbert	Morse	Waggonner
Gill	Morton	Watson
Glenn	Moss	Watts
Gonzalez	Multer	Weltner
Goodell	Murphy, Ill.	Westland
Grabowski	Murphy, N.Y.	White
Gray	Murray	Whitener
Green, Oreg.	Nedzi	Wickersham
Green, Pa.	Nix	Widnall
Griffiths	O'Brien, N.Y.	Wilson, Charles H.
Grover	O'Hara, Ill.	
Gubser	O'Hara, Mich.	Wright
Hagan, Ga.	O'Konski	Wydler
Hagen, Calif.	Olsen, Mont.	Wyman
Halpern	O'Neill	Young
Hanna	Osmers	Zablocki

NAYS—131

Abbitt	Cleveland	Harsha
Abele	Collier	Harvey, Ind.
Abernethy	Colmer	Harvey, Mich.
Adair	Cramer	Hechler
Andrews, Ala.	Cunningham	Hoeven
Ashbrook	Curtin	Horan
Ayres	Curtis	Huddleston
Baker	Dague	Hutchinson
Baldwin	Derwinski	Jarman
Battin	Devine	Jensen
Beermann	Dole	Johansen
Belcher	Dorn	Jonas
Bennett, Fla.	Dowdy	Jones, Ala.
Berry	Everett	Kyl
Betts	Findley	Langen
Bray	Fisher	Latta
Brock	Ford	Lennon
Brotzman	Foreman	McClory
Broyhill, N.C.	Fountain	MacGregor
Burleson	Gathings	Marsh
Burton, Utah	Goodling	Martin, Calif.
Chamberlain	Grant	Martin, Nebr.
Chelf	Griffin	May
Chenoweth	Gross	Meader
Clancy	Gurney	Mills
Clark	Haley	Minshall
Clawson, Del	Hall	Mosher
Natcher	Rogers, Tex.	Springer
Nelsen	Roudebush	Stinson
Perkins	Rumsfeld	Stubblefield
Pickle	St. George	Taft
Pillion	Saylor	Thomson, Wis.
Poage	Schadeberg	Tuck
Poff	Schenck	Utt
Quie	Schneebeli	Weaver
Quillen	Schweiker	Whalley
Randall	Secrest	Wharton
Reid, Ill.	Selden	Whitten
Reifel	Short	Williams
Rhodes, Ariz.	Shriver	Wilson, Bob
Rich	Siler	Wilson, Ind.
Roberts, Ala.	Skubitz	Winstead
Roberts, Tex.	Smith, Va.	Younger
Rogers, Fla.	Snyder	

NOT VOTING—56

Alger	Halleck	Norblad
Arends	Harris	Olson, Minn.
Ashmore	Hébert	Passman
Avery	Holifield	Pilcher
Baring	Hull	Rains
Bass	Jennings	Rivers, S.C.
Bennett, Mich.	Jones, Mo.	Ryan, Mich.
Bolling	Karth	Sikes
Brademas	Kee	Slack
Bromwell	Keogh	Staebler
Bruce	Kilburn	Teague, Tex.
Buckley	Knox	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Toll
Dawson	Lankford	Tupper
Duncan	Leggett	Van Pelt
Evins	Lesinski	Vinson
Forrester	Lloyd	Wallhauser
Frelinghuysen	McIntire	Willis
Fulton, Tenn.	Miller, N.Y.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Bruce.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Slack with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Holifield with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Passman.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Staebler.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY, MORRISON, and CORBETT.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to consider the bill (H.R. 9070) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members speaking in general debate may have the privilege of including charts, tables, and other pertinent matter with their statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 9070, with Mr. GARY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 14 minutes.

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of satisfaction and with great pleasure that I advise the House that H.R. 9070, the wilderness bill as amended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is a compromise measure that I feel can be supported by everyone.

In bringing the bill to the floor today I take this opportunity to acknowledge the cooperation of those who have made it possible for this compromise to have been reached. I want the record to be clear that the Kennedy and Johnson administrations cooperated very closely with the chairman of your Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now speaking.

President Kennedy was personally interested in the success of the movement for a compromise wilderness bill, which was assured just a few days before the tragedy of November 22, 1963.

So many others contributed to the development of the compromise that I could not possibly name and thank them all. I would be remiss, however, if I did not mention the cooperative spirit of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], long one of the leading advocates of wilderness preservation; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] who, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, conducted the hearings on this legislation; and finally, those private citizens representing organizations interested in the use of national forests and other federally own lands, ranging from those who desire preservation of large areas in their natural state through those who seek recreation in these areas and to those whose livelihood depends on the availability of these public land areas.

There is no statutory authority at the present time to set aside and retain areas of federally owned lands in their natural state. However, since 1924 the Chief of the Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture have in one way or another set aside areas within the national forests for wilderness preservation. For the past several years we have had a national dis-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

cattlemen is for the House to pass my resolution. This would limit meat imports in general to the average for the 5-year period ending on December 31, 1963. It would assign strict quotas to beef-producing nations, setting an import ceiling 30 percent below last year's nonrestrictive quota.

The cattle industry is today one of the most significant elements in the American agricultural economy. For example, $1 of every $5 received from sales of agricultural products is derived from calves and cattle. Moreover, 80 percent of the U.S. corn crop and 70 percent of all harvested crops are consumed by American stock; and, of course, the beef industry indirectly affects the entire economy, from the large implement manufacturers to small local businesses.

The Senate passage of H.R. 1839 to restrict the importation of beef, veal, lamb, and mutton challenges the House of Representatives to respond in like manner to the problems facing American stockmen.

The establishment of import quotas will not, of course, completely solve the price dilemma which faces cattlemen. Yet imports add significantly to the low price problem; and the setting up of quotas would make a meaningful contribution to improving the outlook for the U.S. agricultural economy. A very few years ago, the beef imports constituted only from 2 percent to 4 percent of the total market. In 1963 the figure was over 11 percent. Such an increase must inevitably affect the domestic cattle raisers to a large degree. Furthermore, this great rise in imports occurred at a critical time when there was an increase in domestic production, thus aggravating an already adverse situation. American stockmen are certainly prepared to accept and deal with the normal cyclical fluctuations in the domestic beef market, but a new element has complicated their problems. It must be remembered that prior to 1958 the U.S. beef and cattle markets were, in effect, protected. The modification of the United Kingdom-Australian meat agreement in that year released a flood of Australian beef exports. The maintenance and increase of western European trade barriers has helped to concentrate this Australian increase on the already unstable beef market in the United States. American stockmen have suffered because of the actions of the United Kingdom in encouraging its own cattle industry. In my own State of Montana, a recent study shows that our State lost nearly $4 million in 1963 alone because of imports of beef and veal. How long can we allow this situation to exist?

It has been charged that congressional legislation of quotas would impair the position of the executive division of our Government in its negotiations in Geneva for a lowering of trade barriers. Yet this position is indeed open to question. While the United States provides fewer restrictions and higher prices than the other nations importing large quantities of meat, both Australia and New Zealand effectively prohibit importation of most meats. In view of this, it would seem that a firm, resolute stand by the Congress of the United States would strengthen the American trade position, since it would show U.S. desire to rectify unfair and unbalanced trade situations. American negotiators in Geneva would be able to reach more equitable agreements if they were able to bargain on the basis of a clear statement of concern for domestic industries by the elected Representatives of the American people.

It has also been stated that establishment of beef import quotas would damage our relations with our allies, particularly Australia and New Zealand. This charge also seems questionable. We must remember that Germany recently increased tremendously their tariff on frozen chickens without damaging the United States-German alliance; and, as pointed out before, both Australia and New Zealand restrict importations of meats. The proposed American quota on beef is certainly a modest measure. Between allies a certain flexibility, a certain give and take is part of the normal course of relations. This import bill certainly falls in this category.

But one of the most important considerations which calls for passage of this bill lies in the prospects for the future of American stockmen. As the statements of cattle producers from all over the United States clearly indicate, the beef industry and related industries are deeply concerned over what seems to be a lack of interest and understanding by their elected Representatives. The future of cattle prices is uncertain and stockmen know it. A Department of Agriculture study indicates that domestic problems will continue for some time. Furthermore, the current lull in imports cannot be expected to continue indefinitely. When the present beef shortage on the world market ceases, foreign meats may flood America in greater quantities than ever before. The voluntary agreements thus far concluded do not really meet this situtation—by 1966 Ireland, Australia, and New Zealand will be able to ship more beef into the United States than they did even in 1963.

For all these reasons, I am urging the House to support my resolution, House Resolution 812. I have written the Committee on Rules and requested early hearings and favorable consideration.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1647)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964.'

"TITLE I—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY SYSTEMS

"Short title

"SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964'.

"Classification Act employees

"SEC. 102. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (76 Stat. 843; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"'Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,385	$3,500	$3,615	$3,730	$3,845	$3,960	$4,075	$4,190	$4,305	$4,420
GS-2	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430	4,555	4,680	4,805
GS-3	4,005	4,140	4,275	4,410	4,545	4,680	4,815	4,950	5,085	5,220
GS-4	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830
GS-5	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,155	6,320	6,485
GS-6	5,505	5,690	5,875	6,060	6,245	6,430	6,615	6,800	6,985	7,170
GS-7	6,050	6,250	6,450	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250	7,450	7,650	7,850
GS-8	6,630	6,850	7,070	7,290	7,510	7,730	7,950	8,170	8,390	8,610
GS-9	7,220	7,465	7,710	7,955	8,200	8,445	8,690	8,935	9,180	9,425
GS-10	7,900	8,170	8,440	8,710	8,980	9,250	9,520	9,790	10,060	10,330
GS-11	8,650	8,945	9,240	9,535	9,830	10,125	10,420	10,715	11,010	11,305
GS-12	10,250	10,605	10,960	11,315	11,670	12,025	12,380	12,735	13,090	13,445
GS-13	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
GS-14	14,170	14,660	15,150	15,640	16,130	16,620	17,110	17,600	18,090	18,580
GS-15	16,460	17,030	17,600	18,170	18,740	19,310	19,880	20,450	21,020	21,590
GS-16	18,935	19,590	20,245	20,900	21,555	22,210	22,865	23,520	24,175	-------
GS-17	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
GS-18	24,500	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

"(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

"(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

"(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to section 2(b)(4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of compensation, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purpose of section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of the employee.

"(5) If the officer or employee is in a position in grade 16 or 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to which he was promoted on or after the first day of his first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, and if he held such position, or another position in the same grade, on the effective date of this section, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted, as of such effective date, to that rate of basic compensation to which he would have been entitled if the compensation schedule in subsection (a) of this section had been in effect on the date of his promotion.

"(6) If the officer or employees, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, was promoted from one grade under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to another such grade at a rate which is above the minimum rate thereof, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively from the effective date of this section to the date on which he was so promoted, on the basis of the rate which he was receiving during the period from such effective date to the date of such promotion and, from the date of such promotion, on the basis of the rate for that step of the appropriate grade of the General Schedule contained in this section which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the General Schedule for such officer or employee which was in effect (without regard to this Act) at the time of such promotion.

"SEC. 103. (a) Section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1131), relating to new appointments, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 801. All new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade, except that in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission which provide for such considerations as the candidate's existing salary, unusually high or unique qualifications, or a special need of the Government for his services, the head of any department may, with the approval of the Commission in each specific case, appoint individuals to positions in grade 13 and above of the General Schedule at such rate or rates above the minimum rate of the appropriate grade as the Commission may authorize for this purpose. The approval of the Commission in each specific case shall not be required with respect to appointments made by the Librarian of Congress.'.

"(b) Section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(b)), relating to the limitation on numbers of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of such Act, is amended by inserting '(i)' immediately following the words 'in addition to', and by inserting immediately following the words 'which may be placed in such grades' a comma and the following: 'and (ii) two hundred and forty examiner positions under section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 244; 5 U.S.C. 1010) which may be placed in grade 16 and nine such positions which may be placed in grade 17'.

"(c) Section 604(d)(3) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 944(c)(3)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) All rates shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.'.

"Postal field service employees

"SEC. 104. Section 1 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

"'"revenue unit" means that amount of revenue of a post office from mail and special service transactions which is equal to the average sum of postal rates and fees received by the Department during the fiscal year for 1,000 pieces of originating mail and special service transactions determined in accordance with section 2331 of this title.'.

"SEC. 105. Section 702 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 702. Classes of post offices

"'(a) Effective at the beginning of each fiscal year the Postmaster General shall divide post offices into four classes on the basis of the revenue units of each office for the second preceding fiscal year. He shall place in the first class those post offices having 950 or more revenue units. He shall place in the second class those post offices having 190 or more revenue units, but fewer than 950 revenue units. He shall place in the third class those post offices having 36 or more revenue units, but fewer than 190 revenue units. He shall place in the fourth class those post offices having fewer than 36 revenue units.

"'(b) The Postmaster General shall exclude from the revenue credited to a post office for the purposes of this section money received at that office for—

"'(1) setting meters for patrons beyond the area served by the office unless authorized by the Department;

"'(2) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold in large or unusual quantities to be used in mailing matter at other offices; and

"'(3) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold for mailing matter diverted from other offices and mailing of matter so diverted without stamps affixed.

"'(c) Whenever unusual conditions prevail at a post office of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate class based on his estimate of the number of revenue units which the office will have during the succeeding twelve months. Any office so advanced need not be relegated to a lower class before the end of the second fiscal year after the advancement. At that time, the office shall be assigned to the appropriate class in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section.'

"SEC. 106. Section 704 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting 'of the first, second, or third class' appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof '(other than one for which the postmaster furnishes quarters, equipment, and fixtures on an allowance basis)'.

"SEC. 107. Subsection (b)(1) of section 2102 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) for post offices at which the postmaster does not furnish quarters on an allowance basis;'.

"SEC. 108. (a) Section 3501 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting a new subsection (c) following subsection (b) as follows:

"'(c) The Postmaster General shall determine and, effective at the beginning of the first pay period in each calendar year, shall adjust the rankings of all positions for which the number of annual revenue units of a post office or its class is a relevant factor of the ranking, using the revenue units of the preceding fiscal year and the class in which the office will be placed at the beginning of the next fiscal year. The Postmaster General also may adjust rankings of such positions at other times of the year based upon substantial changes in service conditions.'.

"(b) Chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) In subsection (c) of section 3513—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POST OFFICE CLERK. (KP-4)'; and

"(B) Add the following new sentence to the end of paragraph (1): 'This office has fewer than 190 revenue units annually.'.

"(2) In subsection (e) of section 3516—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-18)';

"(B) Delete 'third class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of approximately $1,700' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 40 revenue units annually'.

"(3) In subsection (b) of section 3517—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-20)';

"(B) Delete 'third class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of approximately $4,700' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 110 revenue units annually'.

"(4) In subsection (b) of section 3518—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-22)';

"(B) Delete 'third class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of approximately $6,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 140 revenue units annually'.

"(5) In subsection (b) of section 3519—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-24)'; and

"(B) Delete 'annual receipts of approximately $63,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 1,490 revenue units annually'.

"(6) In subsection (c) of section 3519—

"(A) Change of catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-25)';

"(B) Delete 'second class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of approximately $16,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 380 revenue units annually'.

"(7) Insubsection (b) of section 3520—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-27)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of approximately $63,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 1,490 revenue units annually'.

"(8) In subsection (b) of section 3521—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-29)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' appearing in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $129,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 3,060 revenue units annually'.

"(9) In subsection (b) of section 3522—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-31)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $314,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 7,450 revenue units annually'.

"(10) In subsection (b) of section 3523—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-33)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' appearing in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof: 'This office has approximately 110 employees, approximately 14,350 revenue units annually, 13 government-owned vehicle units, one classified station and 42 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.'.

"(11) In subsection (b) of section 3524—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-35)'; and

"(B) Delete 'annual receipts of $2,700,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 64,000 revenue units annually'.

"(12) In subsection (c) of section 3524—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-36)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $1,000,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 23,700 revenue units annually'.

"(13) In subsection (a) of section 3525—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-37)'; and

"(B) Delete 'annual receipts of $8,460,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 200,000 revenue units annually'.

"(14) In subsection (b) of section 3525—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-38)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $2,700,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 64,000 revenue units annually'.

"(15) In subsection (a) of section 3526—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-39)'; and

"(B) Delete 'annual receipts of $16,900,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 400,000 revenue units annually'.

"(16) In subsection (b) of section 3526—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-40)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $4,470,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 106,000 revenue units annually'.

"(17) In subsection (b) of section 3527—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-42)'; and

"(B) Delete 'annual receipts of $48,000,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 1,000,000 revenue units annually'.

"(18) In subsection (c) of section 3527—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-43)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $8,460,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 200,000 revenue units annually'.

"(19) In subsection (b) of section 3528—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-45)'; and

"(B) Delete 'annual receipts of $140,000,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 2,500,000 revenue units annually'.

"(20) In subsection (c) of section 3528—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-46)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $16,900,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 400,000 revenue units annually'.

"(21) In section 3529—

"(A) Change the catchline immediately preceding paragraph (1) to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-47)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $48,000,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 1,000,000 revenue units annually'.

"(22) In section 3530—

"(A) Change the catchline immediately preceding paragraph (1) to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP-48)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $140,000,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 2,500,000 revenue units annually'.

"SEC. 109. Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows—

"'(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be "PFS". Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

"'*Postal field service schedule*

"'PFS	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$3,945	$4,075	$4,205	$4,335	$4,465	$4,595	$4,725	$4,855	$4,985	$5,115	$5,245	$5,375
2	4,270	4,410	4,550	4,690	4,830	4,970	5,110	5,250	5,390	5,530	5,670	5,810
3	4,615	4,770	4,925	5,080	5,235	5,390	5,545	5,700	5,855	6,010	6,165	6,320
4	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,155	6,320	6,485	6,650	6,816
5	5,345	5,525	5,705	5,885	6,065	6,245	6,425	6,605	6,785	6,965	7,145	7,325
6	5,735	5,925	6,115	6,305	6,495	6,685	6,875	7,065	7,255	7,445	7,635	7,825
7	6,140	6,345	6,550	6,755	6,960	7,165	7,370	7,575	7,780	7,985	8,190	------
8	6,650	6,870	7,090	7,310	7,530	7,750	7,970	8,190	8,410	8,630	------	------
9	7,190	7,430	7,670	7,910	8,150	8,390	8,630	8,870	9,110	9,350	------	------
10	7,830	8,095	8,360	8,625	8,890	9,155	9,420	9,685	9,950	10,215	------	------
11	8,650	8,945	9,240	9,535	9,830	10,125	10,420	10,715	11,010	11,305	------	------
12	9,570	9,895	10,220	10,545	10,870	11,195	11,520	11,845	12,170	12,495	------	------
13	10,575	10,940	11,305	11,670	12,035	12,400	12,765	13,130	13,495	13,860	------	------
14	11,660	12,065	12,470	12,875	13,280	13,685	14,090	14,495	14,900	15,305	------	------
15	12,885	13,330	13,775	14,220	14,665	15,110	15,555	16,000	16,445	16,890	------	------
16	14,240	14,735	15,230	15,725	16,220	16,715	17,210	17,705	18,200	18,695	------	------
17	15,755	16,305	16,855	17,405	17,955	18,505	19,055	19,605	20,155	20,705	------	------
18	17,450	18,060	18,670	19,280	19,890	20,500	21,110	21,720	22,330	22,940	------	------
19	19,345	20,020	20,695	21,370	22,045	22,720	23,395	24,070	------	------	------	------
20	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445	------	------	------	------	------	------	------'

"SEC. 110. Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows—

"'(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be "RCS".

"'*Rural carrier schedule*

	"'Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carriers in rural delivery service:												
Fixed compensation per annum	$2,240	$2,345	$2,450	$2,555	$2,660	$2,765	$2,870	$2,975	$3,080	$3,185	$3,290	$3,395
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25'.

"SEC. 111. (a) Section 3544 of title 39, United States Code, is amended, to read as follows:

"'§ 3544. Fourth Class Office Schedule

"'(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedule and for which the symbol shall be "FOS", for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based on the revenue units of the post office for the preceding fiscal year. Basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"'Fourth-class office schedule

"'Revenue units	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but less than 36	$3,769	$3,894	$4,019	$4,144	$4,269	$4,394	$4,519	$4,644	$4,769	$4,894	$5,019	$5,144
24 but less than 30	3,485	3,600	3,715	3,830	3,945	4,060	4,175	4,290	4,405	4,520	4,635	4,750
18 but less than 24	2,877	2,974	3,071	3,168	3,265	3,362	3,459	3,556	3,653	3,750	3,847	3,944
12 but less than 18	2,258	2,331	2,404	2,477	2,550	2,623	2,696	2,769	2,842	2,915	2,988	3,061
6 but less than 12	1,628	1,680	1,732	1,784	1,836	1,888	1,940	1,992	2,044	2,096	2,148	2,200
Less than 6	1,313	1,355	1,397	1,439	1,481	1,523	1,565	1,607	1,649	1,691	1,733	1,775

"'(b) The basic salary of postmasters in fourth-class post offices shall be readjusted for changes in revenue units at the start of the first pay period after January 1 of each year. When a post office is restored to a revenue unit category held by it prior to relegation to a lower revenue unit category, the postmaster's basic salary may be adjusted to the highest salary step held by him when the post office was in the higher revenue unit category. In all other cases, in adjusting a postmaster's basic salary under this section, the basic salary shall be fixed at the lowest step which is higher than the basic salary received by the postmaster at the end of the preceding fiscal year. If there is no such step the basic salary shall be fixed at the highest step for the adjusted revenue units of the office. Each increase in basic salary because of change in revenue units shall be deemed the equivalent of a step increase under section 3552 of this title and the waiting period, for purposes of advancement to the next step, shall begin on the date of adjustment.

"'(c) The basic salaries of postmasters at newly established offices of the fourth class shall be fixed at the lowest salary rate. Whenever unusual conditions prevail at any post office of the fourth class the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate category based on his estimate of the number of revenue units which the office will have during the succeeding twelve months. Any fourth-class office advanced to the appropriate category pursuant to this subsection shall not be reduced in category until the start of the first pay period after January 1 of the calendar year following the calendar year in which it was so advanced, at which time it shall be assigned to the category indicated by the revenue units for the preceding fiscal year.

"'(d) Persons who perform the duties of postmaster at post offices of the fourth class where there is a vacancy or during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave, or leave without pay, shall be paid the same basic salary to which they would have been entitled if regularly appointed as postmaster.

"'(e) The Postmaster General may allow to postmasters in fourth-class post offices additional compensation for separating services and for unusual conditions during a portion of the year, in lieu of an allowance for clerical services for this purpose.

"'(f) At seasonal post offices of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may authorize the payment of the basic salary prorated over the pay periods the office is open for business during the fiscal year.

"'(g) Where the revenue units of a post office of the third class for each of two consecutive fiscal years are less than 36, or where in any fiscal year the revenue units are less than 33, the post office shall be relegated to the fourth class and the basic salary of the postmaster shall be fixed in the manner provided in subsection (b) of this section.

"'(h) When required by the Postmaster General a postmaster at a fourth-class office shall, and any other postmaster in PFS level 5 when permitted by the Postmaster General may, furnish quarters, fixtures, and equipment for an office on an allowance basis. The allowance for this purpose shall be an amount equal to 15 per centum of the basic compensation for the postmaster at the office.'

"(b) As of the effective date of this section, the Postmaster General shall place the position of each postmaster in a fourth-class office in the appropriate revenue units category of the Fourth-class Office Schedule (FOS) determined on the basis of revenue units for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. The Postmaster General shall assign each such postmaster to the lowest step of the appropriate revenue units category which will provide him compensation not less than 110 per centum of the compensation to which he would otherwise be entitled under FOS II (as it existed immediately prior to the effective date of this section). If there is no such step or category, the postmaster shall be paid compensation at the rate of 110 per centum of the compensation to which he would otherwise be entitled under FOS II (as it existed immediately prior to the effective date of this section).

"(c) If changes in the gross receipts category or changes in salary step would occur on the effective date of this section (without regard to the enactment of this section), such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to any action taken under subsection (b) of this section.

"SEC. 112. (a) Subsection (a) of section 6007 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The Postmaster General shall pay to persons, other than special delivery messengers at post offices of the first class, for making delivery of special delivery mail such fees as may be established by him not in excess of the special delivery fee.'.

"(b) Section 2009 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting 'at any price less than eight cents per piece' and inserting in lieu thereof 'at any price less than the fees established pursuant to section 6007(a) of this title.'.

"SEC. 113. Section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'gross receipts' in subsection (a)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof 'revenue unit'; and

"(2) by striking out 'gross receipts' in subsection (f)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof 'revenue unit'.

"SEC. 114. (a) Section 3552(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a)(1) Each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, each employee subject to the Rural Carrier Schedule, and each employee subject to the Fourth Class Office Schedule who has not reached the highest step for his position shall be advanced successively to the next higher step as follows:

"'(A) to steps 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of fifty-two calendar weeks of satisfactory service; and

"'(B) to steps 8 and above—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of satisfactory service.

"'(2) The receipt of an equivalent increase during any of the waiting periods specified in this subsection shall cause a new full waiting period to commence for further step increases.'

"(b) Section 3552 of title 39, United States Code, is further amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"'(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, the Postmaster General is authorized to advance any employee in PFS level 9 or below who—

"'(1) was promoted to a higher level between July 9, 1960, and October 13, 1962, and

"'(2) is senior with respect to total postal service to an employee in his own post office promoted to the same position since October 13, 1962, and is at a step in the level below the step of the junior employee.

Any increase under the provisions of this subsection shall not constitute an equivalent increase and credit earned prior to adjustment under this subsection for advancement to the next step shall be retained.'.

"SEC. 115. (a) Section 711 of title 39, United States Code, is repealed.

"(b) The table of contents of chapter 7 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting

"'711. Method of determining gross receipts.

"SEC. 116. The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule or the Rural Carrier Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

"(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

"(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this section, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

"Employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration

"SEC. 117. (a) Section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the appointment and annual salaries of certain staff positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director

"'(a) The Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the following—

"'(1) The Chief Medical Director, who shall be the Chief of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and shall be directly responsible to the Administrator for the operations of the Department. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

"'(2) The Deputy Chief Medical Director, who shall be the principal assistant of the Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

"'(3) Not to exceed five Assistant Chief Medical Directors, who shall be appointed by the Administrator upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director. One Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine who shall be directly responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Dental Service.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"'(4) Such Medical Directors as may be appointed by the Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, to suit the needs of the Department. A Medical Director shall be either a qualified doctor of medicine or a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine.

"'(5) A Director of Nursing Service, who shall be a qualified registered nurse, appointed by the Administrator, and who shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Nursing Service.

"'(6) A Chief Pharmacist and a Chief Dietitian, appointed by the Administrator.

"'(7) Such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by this chapter.

"'(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any appointment under this section shall be for a period of four years, with reappointment permissible for successive like periods, except that persons so appointed or reappointed shall be subject to removal by the Administrator for cause.

"'(c) The Administrator may designate a member of the Chaplain Service of the Veterans' Administration as Director, Chaplain Service, for a period of two years, subject to removal by the Administrator for cause. Redesignation under this subsection may be made for successive like periods. An individual designated as Director, Chaplain Service, shall at the end of his period of service as Director revert to the position, grade, and status which he held immediately prior to being designated Director, Chaplain Service, and all service as Director, Chaplain Service, shall be creditable as service in the former position.'.

"(b) The table of contents of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"'4103. Appointments and compensation.'

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"'4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director.'.

"(c) Section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), shall not apply to any individual appointed, before January 1, 1964, as Chief Medical Director under section 4103 of title 38, United States Code; but section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a), shall apply, in accordance with its terms, to any such individual.

"SEC. 118. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"'(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"'*Section 4103 schedule*

"'Assistant Chief Medical Director, $24,500.

"'Medical Director, $21,445 minimum to $24,445 maximum.

"'Director of Nursing Service, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"'Director, Chaplain Service, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"'Chief Pharmacist, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"'Chief Dietitian, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"'(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"'*Physician and dentist schedule*

"'Director grade, $18,935 minimum to $24,175 maximum.

"'Executive grade, $17,655 minimum to $23,190 maximum.

"'Chief grade, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $14,170 minimum to $18,580 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $12,075 minimum to $15,855 maximum.

"'Full grade, $10,250 minimum to $13,445 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $8,650 minimum to $11,305 maximum.

"'*Nurse schedule*

"'Assistant Director grade, $14,170 minimum to $18,580 maximum.

"'Chief grade, $12,075 minimum to $15,855 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $10,250 minimum to $13,445 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $8,650 minimum to $11,305 maximum.

"'Full grade, $7,220 minimum to $9,425 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $6,315 minimum to $8,205 maximum.

"'Junior grade, $5,505 minimum to $7,170 maximum.

"'(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position.'.

"Foreign service officers; staff officers and employees

"SEC. 119. Section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows:

"'Foreign service officers

"'SEC. 412. There shall be ten classes of Foreign Service officers, including the classes of career ambassador and of career minister. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be at the rate provided by law for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be at the rate provided by law for level V of such schedule. The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"'Class 1	$22,650	$23,440	$24,500	$20,200	$20,835	$21,470	$22,105
Class 2	18,295	18,930	19,565	16,405	16,920	17,435	17,950
Class 3	14,860	15,375	15,890	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595
Class 4	12,075	12,495	12,915	10,980	11,325	11,670	12,015
Class 5	9,945	10,290	10,635	9,150	9,435	9,720	10,005
Class 6	8,295	8,580	8,865	7,715	7,950	8,185	8,420
Class 7	7,010	7,245	7,480	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250'.
Class 8	6,050	6,250	6,450				

"SEC. 120. Subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) There shall be ten classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees. The per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"'Class 1	$14,860	$15,375	$15,890	$16,405	$16,920	$17,435	$17,950	$18,465	$18,980	$19,495
Class 2	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
Class 3	9,945	10,290	10,635	10,980	11,325	11,670	12,015	12,360	12,705	13,050
Class 4	8,295	8,580	8,865	9,150	9,435	9,720	10,005	10,290	10,575	10,860
Class 5	7,480	7,735	7,990	8,245	8,500	8,755	9,010	9,265	9,520	9,775
Class 6	6,755	6,980	7,205	7,430	7,655	7,880	8,105	8,330	8,555	8,780
Class 7	6,205	6,410	6,615	6,820	7,025	7,230	7,435	7,640	7,845	8,050
Class 8	5,490	5,675	5,860	6,045	6,230	6,415	6,600	6,785	6,970	7,155
Class 9	5,010	5,175	5,340	5,505	5,670	5,835	6,000	6,165	6,330	6,495
Class 10	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830'.

"SEC. 121. Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

"Agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees

"SEC. 122. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102 of this Act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

"Miscellaneous provision

"SEC. 123. Section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 1173) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) The rate of basic compensation, established under this section, and received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of a statutory increase in the compensation schedules of the salary systems specified in subsection (a) shall be initially adjusted on the effective date of such new compensation schedules in accordance with conversion rules and regulations prescribed by the President or by such agency or agencies as he may designate.'

"SEC. 124. Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes', approved August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838; 3 U.S.C. note fol. 102), is amended by striking out '$50,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$65,000'.

"Absorption of costs

"SEC. 125. (a) The cost of not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate amount of the increases in compensation provided by this title for the fiscal year 1965 shall be absorbed by the departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch; and no amount beyond the additional sum for such compensation increases proposed in the budget for the fiscal year 1965 is authorized to be appropriated by any provision of this Act. The total amount of such absorption shall be alloocated by the Bureau of the Budget among such departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in such manner and to such extent as

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

the Director of the Bureau of the Budget deems appropriate in the light of their essential functions.

"(b) Pursuant to the objective of this section, heads of the executive branch activities concerned are directed to review with meticulous care each vacancy resulting from voluntary resignation, retirement, or death and to determine whether the duties of the position can be reassigned to other employees or whether the position can be abolished without seriously affecting the execution of essential functions.

"(c) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be held or considered to require (1) the separation from the service of any individual by reduction in force or other personnel action or (2) the placing of any individual in a leave-without-pay status.

"TITLE II—FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE SALARIES

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1964'.

"SEC. 202. (a) Each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation in an amount equal to the greater of the following amounts, as applicable:

"(1) an amount equal to 3½ per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law) in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section plus 1 per centum of such gross rate for each whole multiple, or part of a multiple, of $500 basic compensation; or

"(2) an amount equal to 5 per centum of such gross rate.

"(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this title, shall be increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase provided by subsection (a) of this section in that gross rate which is nearest in amount to the total annual compensation of such officer or employee.

"(c) Each of the limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives shall be increased by 7 per centum. The amount of each increase under this subsection shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

"(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

"(e) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act, to the lowest multiple of $60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act, the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. No employee whose basic compensation is adjusted under this subsection shall receive any additional compensation under subsection (a) for any period prior to the effective date of such adjustment during which such employee was employed in the office of the Senator by whom he is employed on the first day of the month following the enactment of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person under subsection (a) for any period prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act during which such person was employed in the office of a Senator (other than a Senator by whom he is employed on such day) unless on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act such Senator notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he wishes such employee to receive such additional compensation for such period. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

"(f) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (g), the rates of gross compensation of the Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, the Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase which would be provided by subsection (a) of this section in that gross rate determined without regard to the provisions referred to in subsection (g) of this section which is nearest in amount to the total annual compensation of such officer or employee.

"(g) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading "SENATE" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86-568), is amended by striking out '$18,880' and inserting in lieu thereof '$22,945'.

"(h) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 7 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

"(i) The gross rate of compensation of the Postmaster of the Senate shall be $18,420, and the gross rate of compensation of the Assistant Postmaster of the Senate shall be $14,570. The provisions of section 106 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1963, shall not hereafter apply to employees referred to in this subsection.

"(j) Section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(e)), is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$8,880' where it first appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,'; and

"(2) by striking out '$8,880' at the second place where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended'.

"(k)(1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rule making power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

"(2) Clause 28(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

"(A) by striking out '$8,880' where it first appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,'; and

"(B) by striking out '$8,880' at the second place where it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

"SEC. 203. (a) The compensation of the Comptroller General of the United States shall be at the rate of $30,000 per annum.

"(b) The compensation of the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States shall be at the rate of $28,500 per annum.

"(c) The compensation of the General Counsel of the United States General Accounting Office, the Librarian of Congress, the Public Printer, and the Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $27,000 per annum.

"(d) The compensation of the Deputy Librarian of Congress, the Deputy Public Printer, and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $25,500 per annum.

"(e) The compensation of the Second Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $23,500 per annum.

"(f) The compensation of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $12,500 per annum.

"(g) The compensation of the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Legislative Counsel of the Senate shall be at the rate of $27,500 per annum.

"(h) The compensation of the Chaplain of the Senate shall be at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"SEC. 204. Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 31), is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $30,000 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $43,000 per annum.'

"SEC. 205. No officer or employee subject to section 202(a) or 202(b) of this title shall receive, by reason of any provision of this title, an increase in gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law), or in total annual compensation, which is in excess of the amount of the increase in basic compensation provided by the amendment made by section 102(a) of title I of this Act for positions in grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"TITLE III—FEDERAL EXECUTIVE SALARIES

"SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964'.

"SEC. 302. There is hereby established for offices and positions to which section 303 of this title applies a basic compensation schedule, to be known as the 'Federal Executive Salary Schedule', which shall be divided into five salary levels.

"SEC. 303. (a) Level I of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $35,000:

"(1) Secretary of State.
"(2) Secretary of the Treasury.
"(3) Secretary of Defense.
"(4) Attorney General.
"(5) Postmaster General.
"(6) Secretary of the Interior.
"(7) Secretary of Agriculture.
"(8) Secretary of Commerce.
"(9) Secretary of Labor.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"(10) Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) Level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $30,000:

"(1) Deputy Secretary of Defense.

"(2) Under Secretary of State.

"(3) Administrator, Agency for International Development.

"(4) Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"(5) Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"(6) Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

"(7) Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

"(8) Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

"(9) Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.

"(10) Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

"(11) Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

"(12) Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

"(13) Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

"(14) Director of the United States Information Agency.

"(15) Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent: *Provided*, That thereafter the position shall be placed in level III.

"(16) Director of Central Intelligence.

"(17) Secretary of the Air Force.

"(18) Secretary of the Army.

"(19) Secretary of the Navy.

"(c) Level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $28,500:

"(1) Deputy Attorney General.

"(2) Solicitor General of the United States.

"(3) Deputy Postmaster General.

"(4) Under Secretary of Agriculture.

"(5) Under Secretary of Commerce.

"(6) Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

"(7) Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(8) Under Secretary of the Interior.

"(9) Under Secretary of Labor.

"(10) Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs or Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

"(11) Under Secretary of the Treasury.

"(12) Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

"(13) Administrator of General Services.

"(14) Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

"(15) Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"(16) Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development.

"(17) Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

"(18) Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission.

"(19) Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

"(20) Chairman, Board of Directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

"(21) Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

"(22) Chairman, Federal Power Commission.

"(23) Chairman, Federal Trade Commission.

"(24) Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission.

"(25) Chairman, National Labor Relations Board.

"(26) Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.

"(27) Chairman, Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"(28) Chairman, National Mediation Board.

"(29) Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board.

"(30) Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission.

"(31) Comptroller of the Currency.

"(32) Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

"(33) Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense.

"(34) Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"(35) Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

"(36) Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

"(37) Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

"(38) Director of the Peace Corps.

"(39) Director of Selective Service, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent: *Provided*, That thereafter the position shall be placed in Level IV.

"(40) Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

"(41) Director of the National Science Foundation.

"(42) Deputy Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

"(43) President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

"(44) Members, Atomic Energy Commission.

"(45) Members, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

"(46) Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent: *Provided*, That thereafter the position shall be placed in Level IV.

"(d) Level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $27,000:

"(1) Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State.

"(2) Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

"(3) Deputy Administrator of General Services.

"(4) Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"(5) Assistant Administrators, Agency for International Development (6).

"(6) Regional Assistant Administrators, Agency for International Development (4).

"(7) Under Secretary of the Air Force.

"(8) Under Secretary of the Army.

"(9) Under Secretary of the Navy.

"(10) Deputy Under Secretaries of State (2).

"(11) Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture (3).

"(12) Assistant Secretaries of Commerce (4).

"(13) Assistant Secretaries of Defense (7).

"(14) Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force (3).

"(15) Assistant Secretaries of the Army (3).

"(16) Assistant Secretaries of the Navy (3).

"(17) Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare (2).

"(18) Assistant Secretaries of the Interior (4).

"(19) Assistant Attorneys General (9).

"(20) Assistant Secretaries of Labor (4).

"(21) Assistant Postmasters General (5).

"(22) Assistant Secretaries of State (11).

"(23) Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury (4).

"(24) Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission.

"(25) Commissioner, Community Facilities Administration.

"(26) Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration.

"(27) Commissioner, Public Housing Administration.

"(28) Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration.

"(29) Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army.

"(30) Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

"(31) Deputy Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

"(32) Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

"(33) Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

"(34) Deputy Director of the Peace Corps.

"(35) Deputy Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

"(36) Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency.

"(37) Assistant Directors of the Bureau of the Budget (3).

"(38) General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

"(39) General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

"(40) General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

"(41) General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(42) Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

"(43) Solicitor of the Department of Labor.

"(44) General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

"(45) General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

"(46) Counselor of the Department of State.

"(47) Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

"(48) General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury.

"(49) First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

"(50) General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission.

"(51) Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

"(52) Inspector General, Foreign Assistance.

"(53) Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance.

"(54) Members, Civil Aeronautics Board.

"(55) Members, Council of Economic Advisers.

"(56) Members, Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

"(57) Members, Federal Communications Commission.

"(58) Member, Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

"(59) Members, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

"(60) Members, Federal Power Commission.

"(61) Members, Federal Trade Commission.

"(62) Members, Interstate Commerce Commission.

"(63) Members, National Labor Relations Board.

"(64) Members, Securities and Exchange Commission.

"(65) Members, Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

"(66) Members, United States Civil Service Commission.

"(67) Members, Federal Maritime Commission.

"(68) Members, National Mediation Board.

"(69) Members, Railroad Retirement Board.

"(e) Level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following officers and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $26,000:

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"(1) Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture.
"(2) Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture.
"(3) Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.
"(4) Administrator, Farmers Home Administration.
"(5) Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture.
"(6) Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture.
"(7) Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.
"(8) Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior.
"(9) Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.
"(10) Administrator of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.
"(11) Deputy Administrators of the Small Business Administration (4).
"(12) Associate Administrator for Administration, Federal Aviation Agency.
"(13) Associate Administrator for Development, Federal Aviation Agency.
"(14) Associate Administrator for Programs, Federal Aviation Agency.
"(15) Associate Administrator for Advanced Research and Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
"(16) Associate Administrator for Space Science and Applications, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
"(17) Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
"(18) Associate Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
"(19) Deputy Associate Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
"(20) Associate Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
"(21) Archivist of the United States.
"(22) Area Redevelopment Administrator, Department of Commerce
"(23) Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Administration.
"(24) Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Administration.
"(25) Assistant Secetary of the Interior for Administration.
"(26) Assistant Attorney General for Administration.
"(27) Assistant Secretary of Labor for Administration.
"(28) Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Administration.
"(29) Assistant General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission.
"(30) Assistant and Science Adviser to the Secretary of the Interior.
"(31) Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.
"(32) Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense.
"(33) Chairman of the Renegotiation Board.
"(34) Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board.
"(35) Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury.
"(36) Chief Forester of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.
"(37) Chief Postal Inspector, Post Office Department.
"(38) Chief, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce.
"(39) Commissioner of Customs, Department of the Treasury.
"(40) Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration.
"(41) Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
"(42) Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.
"(43) Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
"(44) Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice.
"(45) Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.
"(46) Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission.
"(47) Associate Commissioners, Indian Claims Commission (2).
"(48) Commissioner of Patents, Department of Commerce.
"(49) Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration.
"(50) Commissioner of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.
"(51) Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
"(52) Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
"(53) Commissioner of Welfare, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
"(54) Director, Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense.
"(55) Director of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.
"(56) Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.
"(57) Director, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.
"(58) Director, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.
"(59) Director, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.
"(60) Director, Office of Research and Engineering, Post Office Department.
"(61) Director, National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.
"(62) Director of Regulation, Atomic Energy Commission.
"(63) Director of Science and Education, Department of Agriculture.
"(64) Deputy Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, Department of the Treasury.
"(65) Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury.
"(66) Deputy Director, National Science Foundation.
"(67) Deputy Director, Policy and Plans, United States Information Agency.
"(68) Deputy General Counsel, Department of Defense.
"(69) Deputy General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission.
"(70) Associate Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.
"(71) Associate Director for Volunteers, Peace Corps.
"(7) Associate Director for Program Development and Operations, Peace Corps.
"(73) Assistants to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice (2).
"(74) Assistant Directors, Office of Emergency Planning (3).
"(75) Assistant Directors, United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (4).
"(76) Federal Highway Administrator, Department of Commerce.
"(77) Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.
"(78) General Counsel of the Agency for International Development.
"(79) General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force.
"(80) General Counsel of the Department of the Army.
"(81) General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission.
"(82) General Counsel of the Federal Aviation Agency.
"(83) General Counsel of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.
"(84) General Counsel of the Department of the Navy.
"(85) General Counsel of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
"(86) General Counsel of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
"(87) Governor of the Canal Zone.
"(88) Manpower Administrator, Department of Labor.
"(89) Maritime Administrator, Department of Commerce.
"(90) Members, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States.
"(91) Members, Renegotiation Board.
"(92) Members, Subversive Activities Control Board.
"(93) Members, United States Tariff Commission.
"(94) President of the Federal National Mortgage Association.
"(95) Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs), Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
"(96) Deputy Directors of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense (4).
"(97) Assistant Administrator of General Services.
"(98) Director, United States Travel Service, Department of Commerce.
"(99) Executive Director of the United States Civil Service Commission.

"(f) In addition to the offices and positions listed in subsections (d) and (e) of this section, the President is authorized to place from time to time offices and positions held by not to exceed thirty persons in levels IV and V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule when he deems such action necessary to reflect changes in organization, management responsibilities, or workload in any Federal department or agency. Any such action with respect to an office to which appointment is made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall be effective only at the time of a new appointment to such office. Each action taken under this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register, except when it is determined by the President that such publication would be contrary to the interest of the national security. No action shall be taken under this subsection with respect to an office or position the compensation for which is fixed at a specific rate by this section or by statute enacted subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act.

"(g) In addition to the offices and positions listed in subsections (d) and (e) of this section and the offices and positions placed by the President in levels IV and V pursuant to subsection (f) of this section, the President is authorized to place, during the period which begins on the day immediately following the date of enactment of this Act and which terminates on the first day of the sixth month which begins following the date of enactment of this Act, in levels IV and V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule offices and positions held by not to exceed thirty persons, the duties and responsibilities of which he deems appropriate for such levels. No action shall be taken under this subsection with respect to an office or position the compensation for which is fixed at a specific rate by this section or by statute enacted subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 304 (a) Section 104 of title 3, United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President), is amended by striking out '$35,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$43,000'.

"(b) Section 105 of title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 105. Compensation of secretaries and executive, administrative, and staff assistants to President

"'The President is authorized to fix the compensation of the six administrative assistants authorized to be appointed under section 106 of this title, of the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, of the Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, and of eight other secretaries or immediate staff assistants in the White House Office at rates of

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

basic compensation not to exceed that of level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.'.

"Conforming changes in existing law

"SEC. 305. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

"(1) The Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2201–2209), establishing rates of basic compensation for heads of executive departments and other Federal officials.

"(2) Section 3012(h) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Army.

"(3) Section 3013(b) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the annual salaries of the Under Secretary and each Assistant Secretary of the Army at $20,000 a year.

"(4) Section 5031(d) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Navy.

"(5) Section 5033(c) of title 10, United States Code, providing the annual salary of $20,000 a year for the Under Secretary of the Navy.

"(6) Section 304 of Public Law 87–651, approved September 7, 1962 (76 Stat. 526; 10 U.S.C. 5034, note), providing compensation of $20,000 a year for Assistant Secretaries of the Navy.

"(7) Section 8012(g) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Air Force.

"(8) Section 8013(b) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the annual salaries of the Under Secretary and each Assistant Secretary of the Air Force at $20,000 a year.

"(9) Section 137(c) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the compensation of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense at the rate prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments.

"(10)(A) The last sentence of section 22 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 924; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2032(a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of such Commission, which reads: 'Each member, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 per annum; and the member designated as Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.'.

"(B) That part of the first sentence of section 27 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2037(a)), relating to the salary of the Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee which reads: ', and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for an Assistant Secretary of Defense'.

"(11) That part of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1958 (72 Stat. 1799 and 861; 75 Stat. 630; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note)—

"(A) In section 2(b), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, which reads: 'and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments';

"(B) In section 2(c), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Director of such Office, which reads: 'shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the under secretaries referred to in section 104 of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 (5 U.S.C. 2203),'; and

"(C) In section 2(d), relating to the annual salaries of three Assistant Directors of such Office, which reads: 'shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments,'.

"(12)(A) That part of the second sentence of section 202(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2472(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which reads: ', and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum'.

"(B) That part of the first sentence of section 202(b) of such Act (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2472(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Administration, which reads: ', shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,500 per annum,'

"(13)(A) That part of section 201(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)), relating to the annual salary of a civilian executive secretary in the National Aeronautics and Space Council, which reads: 'and shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 a year'.

"(B) That part of section 204 of such Act (72 Stat. 431, 432; 42 U.S.C. 2474(a)(1), and (d)), relating to the annual salary of the Chairman of the Civilian-Military Liaison Committee, as follows:

"In subsection (a)(1), that part which reads: ', and shall receive compensation(in the manner provided in subsection (d)) at the rate of $20,000 per annum'.

"In the second sentence of subsection (d), that part which reads: 'fixed by subsection (a)(1)'.

"(14)(A) That part of the second sentence of section 2(a) of the Act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U.S.C. 151b(a)) as amended, relating to the rank and salary of the Counselor and of the Legal Adviser of the Department of State, which reads: 'and shall receive the same salary as'.

"(B) The last sentence of section 2(a) of the Act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U.S.C. 151b(a)) as amended, relating to the rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Under Secretaries of State, which reads: 'Unless otherwise provided for by law, the rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Under Secretaries of State shall be the same as that of Assistant Secretaries of State.'.

"(C) That part of the second sentence of section 2(b) of the Act of May 26, 1949, as amended (73 Stat. 265; 5 U.S.C. 151b(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs or for Economic Affairs, as designated by the President, which reads: 'shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 a year and'.

"(15) The last sentence of 210(a) of title 38, United States Code, relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, which reads: 'He shall receive a salary of $21,000 a year, payable monthly.'.

"(16)(A) The last sentence of section 201(a)(2) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 741; 49 U.S.C. 1321(a)(2)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which reads: 'Each member of the Board shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum, except that the member serving as Chairman shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,500 per annum.'.

"(B) That part of the second sentence of section 301(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 744; 49 U.S.C. 1341(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, which reads: ', and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per anuum'.

"(C) That part of the second sentence of section 302(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 744; 49 U.S.C. 1342(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Agency, which reads: 'shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum, and'.

"(17)(A) The last sentence of section 22 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2562), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which reads: 'He shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.'.

"(B) The second sentence of section 23 of such Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2563), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Director of such Agency, which reads: 'He shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,500 per annum.'.

"(C) The second sentence of section 24 of such Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2564), relating to the annual salaries of the four Assistant Directors of such Agency, which reads: 'They shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum.'.

"(18) Section 3 of the Act of March 2, 1955 (69 Stat. 10; 5 U.S.C. 294, 293, 295a), relating to the annual salaries of certain officials of the Department of Justice, which reads:

"'SEC. 3. (a) The compensation of the Deputy Attorney General shall be at the rate of $21,000 per annum.

"'(b) The compensation of the Solicitor General shall be at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

"'(c) The compensation of each Assistant Attorney General, other than the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum.'.

"(19)(A) The last sentence of section 102(c) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 7 of 1961 (75 Stat. 840; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of the Federal Maritime Commission, which reads: 'The Chairman of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,500 per annum, and each of the other Commissioners shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum.'.

"(B) That part of section 201 of such reorganization plan (75 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the annual salary of the Maritime Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: 'shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum,'.

"(20) That part of the fourth sentence of section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (74 Stat. 408 and 913; 15 U.S.C. 78d(a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and Commissioners of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which reads: 'shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 a year, except that the Chairman shall receive additional salary at the rate of $500 a year and'.

"(21) Section 8 of the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 (72 Stat. 1789; 5 U.S.C. 2205, note), fixing the annual salary of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs at $20,000 per annum.

"(22) That part of the first sentence of section 3 of the Area Redevelopment Act (75 Stat. 48; 42 U.S.C. 2502), relating to the annual salary of the Area Redevelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: 'who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce'.

"(23) The last sentence of section 203(b)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (72 Stat. 520; 5 U.S.C. 171c(b)(1))), relating to the annual salary of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, which reads: 'The compensation of the Director is that prescribed by law for the Secretaries of the military departments.'.

"(24) In section 303(a) of title 23, United States Code,

"(A) That part of the second sentence, relating to the annual salary of the Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: 'shall receive basic compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments and'; and

"(B) The last sentence, relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Federal Highway Administrator in such department, which reads: 'The Deputy Federal Highway Administrator shall receive basic compensation at a rate $1,000 less than the rate provided for the Federal Highway Administrator.'.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"(25) The last proviso in the paragraph under the heading 'IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE' and under the subheading 'SALARIES AND EXPENSES' in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 251; 5 U.S.C. 2206, note), relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which reads: ': *Provided further*, That, hereafter, the compensation of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be $20,000 per annum'.

"(26) The second paragraph of section 3 of title 35, United States Code, relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of Patents which reads: 'The annual rate of compensation of the Commissioner shall be $20,000.'.

"(27) That part of section 4(a) of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612; 22 U.S.C. 2503(a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Director and of the Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, which reads: ', whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $20,000 per annum,' and ', whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $19,500 per annum'.

"(28)(A) Section 308 of title 39, United States Code, fixing the annual rate of basic compensation of the position of Chief Postal Inspector in the Post Office Department at $19,000.

"(B) That part of the table of contents of chapter 3 of title 39, United States Code, which reads as follows:

"'308. Chief Postal Inspector.'.

"(29) That part of the first sentence of section 4 of the International Travel Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 130; 22 U.S.C. 2124), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the United States Travel Service in the Department of Commerce, which reads: 'who shall be compensated at the rate of $19,000 per annum,'.

"(30) Section 14(b) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 716; 5 U.S.C. 3013(b)), which fixes the compensation of the Executive Director of the United States Civil Service Commission at $19,000 per annum.

"(31) That part of the first sentence of section 107(c) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (73 Stat. 211; 50 U.S.C. App. 1217(c)), relating to the annual salary of the General Counsel of the Renegotiation Board, which reads: ', and shall receive compensation at the rate of $19,000 per annum'.

"(32)(A) That part of the third sentence in section 201(a) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 538; 40 U.S.C. 681(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency, which reads: ', and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the maximum rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, plus $500 per annum'.

"(B) That part of the first sentence of section 201(b) of such Act (74 Stat. 538; 40 U.S.C. 661(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Agency, which reads: ', and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the maximum rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended'.

"(33) The last sentence of section 624(d)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 447; 22 U.S.C. 2384(d)(1)), as amended, fixing the compensation of certain officials in the Department of State, which reads: 'The Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 annually; the Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 annually, and each Assistant Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $19,000 annually.'.

"(34) That part of section 202 of the Act of July 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 305; 5 U.S.C. 623g), relating to the annual salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which reads: ', and whose annual rate of basic compensation shall be $19,000'.

"(35) That part of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1963, under the heading 'DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR' and under the caption 'BUREAU OF RECLAMATION' and the subheading 'ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS' (76 Stat. 1223; 43 U.S.C. 373a–1), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, which reads:

"'After September 30, 1962, the position of Commissioner of Reclamation shall have the annual rate of compensation as provided for positions listed in section 2205(a) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent.'.

"(36) That part of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1962, under the heading 'DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR' and under the caption 'BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION' and the subheading 'CONSTRUCTION' (75 Stat. 728; 16 U.S.C. 832a–1), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, which reads:

"'After October 1, 1961, the position of Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, shall have the same annual rate of compensation as that provided for positions listed in section 2205(b) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent.'.

"(37) Section 205 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 423; 5 U.S.C. 483–1 note, 2206 note), as amended, relating to the salary of the present incumbent of the position of Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the Department of the Interior, and to the salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of such Department, which reads:

"'SEC. 205. After August 31, 1957, the salary of the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration shall be the same as the salary of the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, so long as held by the present incumbent; and the salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Department shall be the same as the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.'.

"(38) The proviso in the first paragraph under the heading 'FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION' and under the subheading 'SALARIES AND EXPENSES' in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1964 (77 Stat. 782; Public Law 88–245), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which reads: ': *Provided*, That the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be $22,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent' and provisions to the same effect contained in other appropriation Acts enacted prior to the effective date of this section relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"(39) That part of section 7801(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, relating to the annual salary of the Assistant General Counsel of the Treasury Department who shall be the Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, which reads: 'and shall receive basic compensation at the annual rate of $19,000'.

"(40)(A) Sections 3018, 5014, and 8018 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the general counsels of the military departments.

"(B) The respective tables of contents of chapters 303, 503, and 803 of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking out

"'3018. Compensation of General Counsel.';

"'5014. Compensation of General Counsel.'; and

"'8018. Compensation of General Counsel.'.

"(41)(A) That part of section 2(a) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1962 (76 Stat. 1253; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the compensation of the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, which reads: 'and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum'.

"(B) That part of section 2(b) of such reorganization plan (76 Stat. 1253; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the compensation of the Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, which reads: 'and receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum'.

"(C) That part of section 22(a) of such reorganization plan (76 Stat. 1255; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the compensation of the Director of the National Science Foundation, which reads: 'shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,000 per annum and'.

"(42) That part of section 624(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 447; 22 U.S.C. 2384(a)), relating to the compensation of twelve officers in the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of such Act, which reads: 'of whom—

"'(1) one shall have the rank of an Under Secretary and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Under Secretary of an executive department;

"'(2) one shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretary and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Deputy Under Secretary of an executive department; and

"'(3) ten shall have the rank of Assistant Secretaries and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Assistant Secretary of an executive department.'.

"(43) That part of the first sentence of section 104(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 174; 8 U.S.C. 1104(b)), relating to the rank and compensation of the Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, which reads: 'and compensation'.

"(44) That part of section 3 of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1953 (67 Stat. 631; 5 U.S.C. 623, note), relating to the Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs), Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which reads: ', and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter provided by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments'.

"SEC. 306. (a)(1) Section 508 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 508. Salaries

"'Subject to subsection (f) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, the Attorney General shall fix the annual salaries of United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title at rates of compensation not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.'.

"(2) Subject to section 303(f) of this Act, each incumbent United States attorney and assistant United States attorney shall be paid compensation at a rate equal to that of attorneys of comparable responsibility and professional qualifications, as determined by the Attorney General, whose compensation

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

is prescribed in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) Section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (70 Stat. 704; 22 U.S.C. 866), relating to the per annum salaries of chiefs of mission, is amended by striking out the second sentence of that section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The per annum salaries of chiefs of mission within each class shall be at the rate provided by law for the levels of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule as follows: class 1, the rate for level II; class 2, the rate for level III; class 3, the rate for level IV; and class 4, the rate for level V.'.

"(c) That part of section 201(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)), fixing a limit of $19,000 on the compensation of seven persons in the National Aeronautics and Space Council, is amended by striking out compensated at the rate of not more than $19,000 a year,' and inserting in lieu thereof compensated at not to exceed the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,'.

"(d) Clause (A) of section 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)), as amended, is amended to read as follows: (A) to the extent the Adminstrator deems such action necessary to the discharge of his responsibilities, he may appoint not more than four hundred and twenty-five of the scientific, engineering, and administrative personnel of the Administration without regard to such laws, and may fix the compensation of such personnel not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and'.

"(e) Section 6(f) of the Act of September 24, 1959 (73 Stat. 706; 5 U.S.C. 2376(f)), relating to the maximum compensation payable to employees of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, is amended by striking out 'at a rate in excess of $20,000 per annum' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'at a rate in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended'.

"(f) The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is further amended as follows:

"(1) In the last sentence of section 24 a. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(a)), relating to the annual salary of the General Manager of such Commission, (A) by inserting 'and' immediately before 'shall be removable by the Commission' and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ', and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $22,000 per annum';

"(2) In the last sentence of section 24 b. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy General Manager of such Commission, (A) by inserting 'and' immediately before 'shall be removable by the General Manager' and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ', and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but 'not in excess of $20,500 per annum';

"(3) In the last sentence of section 24 c. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(c)), relating to the annual salaries of the Assistant General Managers (or their equivalents) of such Commission, (A) by inserting 'and' immediately before 'shall be removable by the General Manager' and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ', and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $20,000 per annum';

"(4) In the second sentence of section 25 a. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(a)), relating to the annual salaries of directors of program divisions of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: 'and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum';

"(5) In section 25 b. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(b)), relating to the annual salary of the General Counsel of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: 'and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,500 per annum';

"(6) In the first sentence of section 25 c. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(c)), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the Inspection Division in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: 'and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum';

"(7) In the last sentence of section 25 d. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(d)), relating to the annual salaries of certain executive management positions in such Commission, (A) by inserting 'and' immediately before 'shall be removable by the General Manager' and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ', and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum'; and

"(8) In the second sentence of section 28 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2038), relating to the compensation of the active member of the Armed Forces serving as Director of the Division of Military Application in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads 'and the compensation prescribed in section 25' and inserting in lieu thereof, 'and the compensation established for this position pursuant to section 303 or section 309 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964'.

"(g) Section 2 of the Act of July 30, 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 712; 70 Stat. 740; 22 U.S.C. 287n), relating to the compensation of the United States representatives and alternates at sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, is amended by striking out 'Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at such rates, not to exceed $15,000 per annum, as the President may determine,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at such rates provided for Foreign Service officers in the schedule contained in section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, as the President may determine,'.

"(h) The third sentence of section 2 of the Act of May 29, 1959 (73 Stat. 63; 50 U.S.C. 402, note), is amended to read as follows: 'Except as provided in subsection (f) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, no officer or employee of the National Security Agency shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of the highest rate of basic compensation contained in such General Schedule.'.

"(i)(1) Sections 2 and 3 of the Act of July 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 414; D.C. Code, secs. 1–204a and 1–204b), relating to the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, are amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided by this section and section 3 of this Act—

"'(1) the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $25,500 each per annum; and

"'(2) the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall receive an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section.

"'SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"'(1) the compensation of the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $26,000 per annum; and

"'(2) if the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army is chosen President of the Board of Commissioners, he shall receive, as President of the Board, an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section.'.

"(2) Section 11–702(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 484; Public Law 88–241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, is amended—

"(A) by striking out '$19,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$25,000'; and

"(B) by striking out '$18,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$24,500'.

"(3) Section 11–902(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 487; Public Law 88–241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, is amended—

"(A) by striking out '$18,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$24,000'; and

"(B) by striking out '$17,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$23,500'.

"(4) The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2402), relating to the compensation of the person appointed to the District of Columbia Tax Court, is amended by striking out '$17,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$23,500'.

"(5) That part of the salary schedule in section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (76 Stat. 1229; D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501), relating to the compensation of the Superintendent of Schools, and Deputy Superintendent of Schools, of the District of Columbia, which reads:

"'Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$19,000
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent	16,500

'.

is amended to read as follows:

"'Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$26,000
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent	22,000

'.

"(6) That part of the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 480), as amended (sec. 4–823, et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 edition), relating to the compensation of the Fire Chief and the Chief of Police, which reads:

"' Class 10	17,000	17,400	17,800	18,200			18,600	19,000
Fire Chief.								
Chief of Police.'								

is amended to read as follows:

"' Class 10	21,000	21,500	22,000	22,500			23,000	23,500
Fire Chief.								
Chief of Police.'								

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"(j)(1) The catchline of section 3012 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out '; compensation'

"(2) The table of contents of chapter 303 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"'3012. Secretary of the Army: powers and duties; delegation by; compensation.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'3012. Secretary of the Army: powers and duties; delegation by.'.

"(3) The catchline of section 5031 of such title 10 is amended by striking out '; compensation'.

"(4) The table of contents of chapter 505 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"'5031. Secretary of the Navy: responsibilities; compensation.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'5031. Secretary of the Navy: responsibilities.'.

"(5) The catchline of section 5033 of such title 10 is amended by striking out '; compensation'.

"(6) The table of contents of chapter 505 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"'5033. Under Secretary of the Navy: appointment; duties; compensation.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'5033. Under Secretary of the Navy: appointment; duties.'.

"(7) The catchline of section 8012 of such title 10 is amended by striking out '; compensation'.

"(8) The table of contents of chapter 803 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"'8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers and duties; delegation by; compensation.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers and duties; delegation by.'.

"Changes in position titles

"SEC. 307. Whenever reference is made in any law or reorganization plan to the—

"Administrative Assistant Attorney General,

"Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior,

"Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture,

"Administrative Assistant Secretary of Labor,

"Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, or

"Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,

"such reference shall be held and considered to mean the

"Assistant Attorney General for Administration,

"Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Administration,

"Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Administration,

"Assistant Secretary of Labor for Administration,

"Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Administration, or

"Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Administration,

respectively.

"Limitation on salaries fixed by administrative action

"SEC. 308. Except as provided by this Act and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the head of any executive department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch who is authorized to fix by administrative action the annual rate of basic compensation for any position, officer, or employee shall not fix such rate in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to impair the authorities provided in the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended (50 U.S.C. 403a and following), in section 3 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831b), in section 9 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1819), in section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248), or in section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 481, relating to the Comptroller of the Currency).

"Miscellaneous positions in the executive branch

"SEC. 309. Each office or position in the executive branch specifically referred to in, or covered by, any conforming change in law made by section 305 of this Act, or any other office or position in the executive branch for which the annual salary is established pursuant to special provision of law enacted prior to the date of enactment of this Act, at a figure of $18,500 or above, which is not placed in a level of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule pursuant to section 303 of this Act, shall be paid basic compensation at a rate which is equal to the salary rate of a grade and step of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. All actions taken under this section shall be reported to the United States Civil Service Commission and published in the Federal Register, except when it is determined by the President that such report and publication would be contrary to the interest of national security.

"Saving provisions

"SEC. 310. (a) Except as provided by this Act, the changes in existing law made by this Act shall not affect any office or position existing immediately prior to the effective date of any such changes in existing law, the compensation attached to such office or position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his entitlement to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken in accordance with this Act or other law.

"(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the rate of basic gross, or total annual compensation received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall not be reduced by reason of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE IV—FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES

"SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Judicial Salary Act of 1964'.

"SEC. 402. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 672 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 28, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding ungraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting in new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(d) Section 40a of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 68(a)), as amended, relating to the compensation of full-time and part-time referees in bankruptcy, is amended by striking out the existing compensation limitations contained therein and inserting new limitations of '$22,500' and '$11,000', respectively.

"SEC. 403. (a) Section 5 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, is amended by striking out '$35,500' and substituting therefor '$40,000', and by striking out '$35,000' and substituting therefor '$39,500'.

"(b) Section 44(d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to circuit judges, is amended by striking out '$25,500' and substituting therefor '$33,000'.

"(c) Section 135 of title 28, United States Code, relating to district judges, is amended by striking out '$22,500' and substituting therefor '$30,000', and by striking out '$23,000' and substituting therefor '$30,500'.

"(d) Section 173 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Claims, is amended by striking out '$25,500' and substituting therefor '$33,000'.

"(e) Section 213 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, is amended by striking out '$25,500' and substituting therefor '$33,000'.

"(f) Section 252 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Customs Court, is amended by striking out '$22,500' and substituting therefor '$30,000'.

"(g) The first paragraph of section 603 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the Director and the Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, is amended to read as follows:

"'The Director shall receive a salary of $27,000 a year. The Deputy Director shall receive a salary of $26,000 a year.'

"(h) Subsection (b) of section 792 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of commissioners of the Court of Claims, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Each commissioner shall receive basic compensation at the rate of $26,000 a year, and also all necessary traveling expenses and a per diem allowance as provided in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business and away from Washington, District of Columbia.'

"(i) Section 7443(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (68A Stat. 879), as amended, relating to judges of the Tax Court of the United States, is further amended by striking out '$22,500' and substituting therefor '$30,000'.

"(j) Section 867(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Military Appeals, is amended by striking out '$25,500' and substituting therefor '$33,000'.

"TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATES

"SEC. 501. (a) Except to the extent provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, this Act and the increases in compensation made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1964.

"(b) Section 204 of this Act, relating to increases in compensation for Members of

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Congress, shall become effective at noon on January 3, 1965.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (but except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section)—

"(1) no rate of compensation which is equal to or in excess of $22,000 per annum shall be increased in any amount, by reason of section 202 of this Act, until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1965; and

"(2) no rate of compensation which is less than $22,000 per annum shall be increased to an amount per annum in excess of $22,000, by reason of section 202 or 203(g) of this Act, until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1965.

"(d) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of such enactment.

"SEC. 502. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the period beginning on the effective date prescribed by section 501(a) and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), as amended (5 U.S.C. 61f–61k), for services rendered during the period beginning on the effective date prescribed by section 501(a) and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by an officer or employee who dies during such period. Such retroactive compensation or salary shall not be considered as basic salary for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of any such retired or deceased officer or employee.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia," and the Senate agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MIKE MONRONEY,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11049) entitled "An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text. The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment and that the Senate agree to the same.

Except for technical and conforming changes, the differences between the House bill and the conference substitute are explained below.

COST OF SALARY INCREASES

The budget expenditure for the fiscal year 1965 under the conference substitute is not expected to exceed $544 million, the President's maximum budget figure for the 1965 fiscal year. The annual cost of the conference substitute would be approximately $558 million on the basis of the current employment figures. However, the Bureau of the Budget has advised that the fiscal year 1965 expenditure because of this legislation will be held to the budget figure of $544 million through attrition, unfilling of vacancies, and other actions to increase the amount of cost absorption required under section 125 of the conference substitute.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TEXT OF THE HOUSE BILL AND THE CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

Title I—Federal employees' salary systems

Title I of both the House bill and the conference substitute provides salary rates reasonably comparable to those for substantially equal responsibilities in private enterprise for employees subject to (1) the Classification Act of 1949; (2) the postal field service compensation provisions of title 39, United States Code; (3) the salary schedules of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; (4) section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; and (5) employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees. The coverage of title I of the House bill is identical to the coverage of title I of the conference substitute. The major differences are discussed below.

Middle salary grades

The House bill guarantees a minimum 3-percent salary increase for postal employees and for employees in the lower grades of the Classification Act of 1949, but less than 3 percent for employees in the middle grades of such act—GS–9, GS–10, GS–11, and GS–12.

Section 102(a) of the conference substitute guarantees a minimum 3-percent increase for the middle grades as well as for the lower grades by increasing the rates provided in the House bill by $10 for GS–9, $60 for GS–10, $100 for GS–11, and $50 for GS–12. All other rates of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 are identical in both the House bill and the conference substitute.

Similar increases are provided under section 118 of the conference substitute for the middle grades of the salary schedules for employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration and under section 119 for the salary schedules of the Foreign Service Act of 1946.

Initial appointments

Section 103(a) of the House bill and 103(a) of the conference substitute both amended section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949 relating to new appointments. The conference substitute adds the requirement to the House bill provisions that new appointments to positions in GS–13 and above at a rate above the minimum rate may be made only with the approval of the Civil Service Commission in each specific case. Such requirement will not apply to appointments made by the Librarian of Congress.

Professional engineering positions

Subsection (b) of section 103 of the House bill excludes professional engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and professional positions in the physical and natural sciences and medicine which are placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 from the provisions of section 507 and titles VII and VIII of such act.

Section 507 relates to salary retention on reduction in grade. Title VII relates to step increases and title VIII relates to such matters as the rate within the grade payable on initial appointment or promotion.

The conference substitute does not include a comparable provision.

Hearing examiners

Section 103(c) of the House bill and section 103(b) of the conference substitute relate to additional positions exempted from the maximum limitation of 2,400 supergrade positions which the Civil Service Commission may approve for GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18.

The House bill added two new exemptions: (1) hearing examiner positions under section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1010); and (2) positions placed in the supergrades in accordance with section 309 of the House bill. In general, section 309 covers certain positions which were not placed in the Federal Executive Salary Schedule by this legislation.

The conference substitute adds to the exemptions from the 2,400 supergrade positions, 240 positions of hearing examiners for GS–16 and 9 positions of hearing examiners for GS–17. The House bill did not contain any numerical limitation on the number of hearing examiner positions to be placed in the supergrades. It is to be noted that the limitations on hearing examiner positions to be exempt from the total limitation of 2,400 does not prohibit the placing of more than 240 hearing examiner positions in grade 16 or more than 9 hearing examiner positions in grade 17 should the Civil Service Commission approve additional hearing examiner positions for the supergrades within the 2,400 numerical limitation.

The second exemption contained in the House bill relating to section 309 is not included in the conference substitute, as section 309 of the conference substitute provides that employees occupying positions covered by section 309 will receive pay equivalent to a rate of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 but does not contemplate that the positions will be placed under the Classification Act of 1949 or placed in the supergrades as did the House version.

Pay computation

Section 103(d) of the House bill amends section 604(d)(3) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 (5 U.S.C. 944(c)(3)) to change the method of computing salary rates for all pay computation purposes affecting most employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia so that in the computation of rates all remaining fractions of a cent shall be eliminated. The existing method of computing rates is to compute in full cents, counting any fraction of a cent as the next higher cent.

Section 103(c) of the conference substitute requires rounding off to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as the next higher cent. This method of computation is the same method now provided under section 3541(f) of title 39, United States Code, for postal employees. Consequently, section 116(b) of the House bill amending section 3541(f) is not included in the conference substitute.

Ranking of positions in the postal service

Section 108(a) of the House bill and section 108(a) of the conference substitute both amend section 3501 of title 39, United States Code, by adding a new subsection (c) relating to the ranking of positions for which the number of annual revenue units of a post office or its class is a relevant factor of the ranking of positions.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Under the conference substitute the reranking of such positions will be as of the beginning of the first pay period in calendar year 1965, whereas the House bill would have required the first reranking of such positions as of the beginning of the first pay period occurring on or after the date of enactment of this bill.

Fourth-class postmasters

Section 111 of the House bill and section 111 of the conference substitute both amend section 3544 of title 39, United States Code, relating to the compensation of postmasters at fourth-class post offices.

The House bill proposes a measure which would accomplish pay reform for postmasters at fourth-class offices in line with reforms provided other Federal employees in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 841; Public Law 87-793, part II). The reform would evaluate the positions of postmasters in fourth-class offices in PFS-5 and determine their pay for essentially part-time work on the basis of actual time required. The proposal would authorize the Postmaster General to establish and determine the work requirements in these part-time offices and to fix the compensation of postmasters accordingly. Where the actual compensation to be fixed by this method was less than that due under FOS schedule II, compensation would have continued to be fixed under FOS schedule II as though such schedule continued in effect.

The House bill also made other changes respecting postmasters in fourth-class offices which recognized the part-time nature of their work. The 15-percent allowance for rent, light, fuel, and equipment was based on the rate for step 1 rather than on the actual compensation of the postmaster as at present where quarters are not furnished. The change would have given the Post Office Department the option to furnish quarters when this was desirable, necessary, or more economical and, at the same time, rationalize the allowance for postmasters furnishing quarters.

Section 111(a) of the conference substitute does not contain the reform measures included in the House bill but provides a new salary schedule for postmasters at fourth-class post offices. The schedule is based on the new revenue unit concept and provides increases ranging from 10 percent in the highest group for fourth-class offices to 15 percent in the lower fourth-class office levels. Postmasters at fourth-class offices of the lowest two existing levels will receive increases substantially in excess of 15 percent of their present salary. This group is among the lowest paid of Federal employees and has the greatest need for substantial salary increases.

The conference substitute also provides the necessary language to properly compensate postmasters at fourth-class offices under the revenue unit concept, to permit the Postmaster General to advance fourth-class offices to higher categories, to compensate persons serving in place of postmasters at fourth-class offices, to provide additional compensation to postmasters at fourth-class offices for unusual conditions, to provide for compensation to postmasters at seasonal fourth-class offices, to provide for the relegation of third-class offices to the fourth-class under certain conditions, and to provide for an allowance of 15 percent basic compensation for quarters, fixtures, and equipment.

Section 111(b) of the conference substitute provides a method of converting postmasters at fourth-class offices to the new schedule. Each postmaster will be placed in the lowest step for his revenue unit category which exceeds his existing compensation by not less than 10 percent. If there is no such step, he will retain his existing compensation plus 10 percent. Because the increases incident to changing to the new schedule are not equivalent increases, any credit toward the next step increase earned prior to the effective date of section 111 will be carried forward for purposes of determining eligibility for the next step increase under the new schedule.

Section 111(c) of the conference substitute provides that changes in gross receipts categories or steps which otherwise would have occurred on the effective date of section 111 shall be considered as occurring prior to conversion.

Because of the change from adjusted gross postal receipts to revenue units for determining class of office and category, some post offices, classified as fourth-class offices on July 1, 1964, will not fall within the revenue unit categories prescribed in the new schedule. In such cases, the offices will be continued as fourth-class post offices until reclassified by operation of other sections of the bill. Postmasters in such offices will continue to receive the 10-percent increase in basic compensation until the salaries are adjusted as otherwise required.

Postal field service annual step increases

Section 114(a) of the conference substitute extends to all levels of the Postal Field Service Schedule annual step increases up to step 7. Under present law, only employees in levels 1 through 6 receive annual step increases up to step 7, and employees in level 7 or above receive annual step increases to steps 2, 3, and 4, and biennial step increases to steps 5, 6, and 7.

The House bill has no comparable provisions.

Staff allowance for former residents

Section 124 of the conference substitute increases the maximum amount available to former Presidents of the United States for compensation payable to their staff employees from the present maximum of $50,000 to $65,000.

The House bill has no comparable provision.

TITLE II

Federal legislative salaries

Title II of the House bill and of the conference substitute both provide increases in rates of compensation for officers and employees of the legislative branch.

Legislative staff salaries

Subsections (e) through (h) of section 202 of the conference substitute contain the usual authority relating to Senate employees in the following respects. Subsection (e) reserves to individual Senators the authority to determine whether increases provided by the bill shall apply to members of their own staffs. Subsection (f) provides increases for employees of the Senate whose compensation has been fixed by law at gross rates. These increases will be comparable to the increases granted under section 202(a) of the conference substitute. Subsection (g) increases the gross compensation limitation for Senate employees from $18,880 to $22,945. Subsection (h) increases the limitation on the gross rate per hour of employees in the Senate folding room.

Section 202(i) of the conference substitute increases the gross rate of compensation of the Postmaster of the Senate to $18,420 and the gross rate of the Assistant Postmaster of the Senate to $14,570. This subsection also excludes these two positions from the longevity provisions of section 106 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1963 (76 Stat. 694; Public Law 87-730).

Section 203(g) provides a rate of compensation of $27,500 per annum for the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Legislative Counsel of the Senate.

Section 203(h) provides a rate of compensation of $15,000 per annum for the Chaplain of the Senate.

The House bill contained no similar provisions relating to Senate employees.

Officers of the legislative branch

Section 203 of the House bill and section 203 of the conference substitute both establish annual rates of compensation for certain officers of the legislative branch. A comparison of the annual rates of basic compensation for these officers is set forth below:

Position title	House bill	Conference substitute
Assistant Comptroller General	$29,000	$28,50
General Counsel of General Accounting Office	28,000	27,00
Librarian of Congress	28,000	27,00
Public Printer	28,000	27,00
Architect of the Capitol	28,000	27,00
Deputy Public Printer	27,000	25,50
Deputy Librarian of Congress	27,000	25,50
Assistant Architect of the Capitol	27,000	25,50
2d Assistant Architect of the Capitol	26,000	23,50

TITLE III

Federal Executive Salaries

Title III of the House bill and title II of the conference substitute both provide for a Federal Executive Salary Schedule and make necessary conforming changes in existing law. The major differences are discussed below.

Federal executive salary schedule

The House bill establishes six salary levels for the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The conference substitute establishes five such levels. A comparison of the annual rates of basic compensation of such levels in the House bill and in the conference substitute is set forth below:

	House bill	Conference substitute
Level I	$32,500	$35,000
Level II	30,000	30,000
Level III	29,000	28,500
Level IV	28,000	27,000
Level V	27,000	26,000
Level VI	26,000	----------

The House bill makes specific assignments of executive positions to level I, level II, level III, and positions held by members of certain boards and commissions to level IV. Also, the House bill authorizes the President to assign positions to level IV, level V, and level VI.

Sections 303(a) through 303(e) of the conference substitute specify positions for all five levels prescribed by the conference substitute.

A comparison showing the different assignments by the conference substitute of certain positions specifically assigned by the House bill is set forth below:

Specific position assignments to different levels

	House	Conference
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency	III	II.
Secretaries of Air Force, Army, and Navy	III	II.
Solicitor General of the United States	(Presidential authority)	III.
Director of Selective Service (present incumbent)	(Presidential authority)	III.
Members, Council of Economic Advisers	III	IV.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Presidential authority

Section 303(f) of the conference substitute grants authority to the President to place offices and positions held by not to exceed 30 persons in levels IV and V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule when he deems such action necessary to reflect changes in organization, management responsibilities, or workload. The subsection also requires that, in the case of an office to which appointment is made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the President may use such authority only at the time of the new appointment. Action by the President under this subsection is required to be published in the Federal Register except when it is determined by the President that such publication would be contrary to the interest of the national security. The authority will not apply to any office or position the compensation for which is fixed at a specific rate by section 303 of the conference substitute or by statute enacted subsequent to the date of enactment of this legislation.

Section 303(g) authorizes the President to place in levels IV and V offices and positions, the duties and responsibilities of which he deems appropriate for such levels, held by not to exceed 30 persons. The authority under this subsection relates to positions which are in addition to positions listed in subsections (d) and (e) of section 303 and which are in addition to the positions acted upon pursuant to subsection (f) of section 303. The authority under this subsection shall not apply with respect to any office or position the compensation for which is fixed at a specific rate by section 303 of the conference substitute or by statute enacted subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

Presidential staff

Section 304(b) of the conference substitute adds the position of the Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council to the 15 positions for which the House bill authorizes the President, under section 105 of title 3, United States Code, to fix rates of basic compensation at a rate not to exceed the rate for level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

Conforming changes in existing law

Section 305 and section 306 of both the House bill and the conference substitute repeal or amend provisions of existing law to bring existing law into conformity with the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964.

The conference substitute omits one repealer contained in the House bill (sec. 305(41)) relating to the annual salaries for not more than three positions of Deputy Governor, Farm Credit Administration.

The conference substitute adds another repealer not contained in the House bill (sec. 305(44)) relating to the rate of compensation for the Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs), Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Section 306 of the conference substitute omits an amending change of the House bill (sec. 306(h)) relating to the compensation of the U.S. representatives and alternates at the sessions of the general council and at sessions of the executive committee of the International Refugee Organization.

Staff of Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

Section 306(e) of the House bill, relating to the maximum compensation payable to the staff of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, increased the present maximum of $20,000 per annum to the rate for level VI of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

Section 306(e) of the conference substitute increases such maximum to a rate not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949.

Director, Division of Military Application, Atomic Energy Commission

Section 306(f)(8) of the House bill, relating to the maximum aggregate compensation of the active member of the Armed Forces serving as Director of the Division of Military Application in the Atomic Energy Commission, increases such maximum to the "compensation for directors of other program divisions." It was contemplated that such compensation would be the rate for GS–18 unless the President were to assign such other program director positions to levels IV, V, or VI of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule as provided for under the House bill.

Section 306(f)(8) of the conference substitute increases such maximum to the "compensation established for this position pursuant to section 303 or section 309 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964." The effect of the conference substitute is to limit the maximum aggregate compensation to the salaries of level IV or V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule if the President assigns the position to either of such levels; but if he does not, the maximum will not exceed the rate for GS–18.

Officers of the District of Columbia

Section 306(j) of the House bill and section 306(i) of the conference substitute both relate to the compensation of officials of the District of Columbia. The conference substitute provides rates $1,000 less in certain cases than the rates provided in the House bill. A comparison of the rates for those officials for which the rates are different is set forth below:

Position	Salary rates	
	House bill	Conference substitute
President, District of Columbia Board of Commissioners	$27,000	$26,000
Other District of Columbia Commissioners	26,500	25,500
Chief judge, District of Columbia Court of Appeals	26,000	25,000
Other judges, District of Columbia Court of Appeals	26,500	24,500
Chief judge, District of Columbia court of general sessions	25,000	24,000
Other judges, District of Columbia court of general sessions	24,500	23,500
Judge, District of Columbia Tax Court	24,500	23,500

Limitations on salaries fixed by administrative action

Section 308 of the House bill limits the salary-fixing authority of the heads of executive departments and agencies by providing that hereafter they may not fix rates in excess of the highest rate for grade GS–18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949. The House bill exempted from this limitation authorities contained in the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403a), the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831b), section 9 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1819), and section 5240, Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 481, relating to the Comptroller of the Currency).

Section 308 of the conference substitute adds one additional authority to the exemptions, which is section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248).

Miscellaneous executive positions

Section 309 of the House bill requires the placement in the appropriate grade of the Classification Act of 1949 of any office or position in the executive branch not placed in a level of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule under section 303 of the House bill but which is affected by any change in existing law under section 305 of the House bill.

Section 309 of the conference substitute provides that each such office or position shall be compensated at a rate equal to the rate of a grade and step of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949. In addition, the conference substitute applies this policy to other offices and positions in the executive branch for which the annual salary is established, at a figure of $18,500 or more, pursuant to a special provision of law enacted prior to the date of enactment of the conference substitute. The conference substitute contains a further provision (not in the House bill) to the effect that all actions taken under section 309 of the conference substitute shall be reported to the U.S. Civil Service Commission and published in the Federal Register, except when the President determines that such report and publication would be contrary to the interest of national security.

TITLE IV

Federal judicial salaries

Section 402(a) of the House bill provides increases in rates of compensation for certain specified employees of the judicial branch of the Government. The increases will be in amounts corresponding to the increases under section 102 of the bill for Classification Act employees.

Section 402(a) of the conference substitute has the same coverage as the House bill but includes an additional provision which has the effect of authorizing the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to determine the amount of the increases for employees appointed pursuant to section 604(a)(5) of title 28, United States Code, who hold "ungraded positions." Graded positions are those under the judiciary salary plan approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States. The ungraded positions are clerks of court, Register of Wills of the District of Columbia, the pretrial examiners in the District of Columbia and in New York, and the assistant pretrial examiner in the District of Columbia.

Section 403 of the House bill and section 403 of the conference substitute both provide increases in the compensation of Federal judges, the Director and Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the Commissioners of the Court of Claims.

The conference substitute changes the rates provided by the House bill for the Justices of the Supreme Court, the Director and Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, and for the Commissioners of the Court of Claims as indicated below:

Position	House bill	Conference substitute
Chief Justice of the United States	$43,000	$40,000
Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States	42,500	39,500
Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	28,000	27,000
Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts	27,000	26,000
Commissioners, Court of Claims	27,000	26,000

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

TITLE V

Salary relationships in Federal executive, judicial, congressional, and career salaries (House bill)

Title V of the House bill provided for the establishment and maintenance, on a permanent basis, of salary relationships with respect to Federal executive, judicial, congressional, and career salaries. This title, which consisted of section 501, contained, in section 501(a), a statement of policy with respect to the desirability of maintaining and continuing, on a permanent basis, the salary relationships established by the House bill among and between the salary rates of (a) the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 and the Postal Field Service Schedule in title I of the House bill; (b) Members of Congress and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in title II; (c) Federal executives in title III; and (d) Federal judges in title IV.

In order to implement this policy, section 501(b) provided, in effect, that, whenever in the future the salary rates of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 shall have been increased by law, the salary rates of officers and positions in the categories referred to above would be increased automatically in accordance with a formula designed to provide increases in such rates proportionate to the General Schedule salary rate increases.

The Senate amendment did not contain comparable provisions.

The conference substitute omits these provisions of title V of the House bill.

TITLE VI

Effective dates

Title VI of the House bill and title V of the conference substitute both relate to the effective dates for the various provisions of the bill.

Section 601(a) of the House bill provides that, except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), the increases in compensation would become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment.

Section 601(b) provided that increases for Members of Congress would become effective at noon, January 3, 1965.

Section 601(c) prohibits any rate of compensation from being increased to an amount per annum in excess of $22,000 until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1965.

Section 501(a) of the conference substitute provides as an effective date the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1964, except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of the section. Because the effective date of section 105, relating to the classification of post offices, is later than July 1, 1964, it will not disturb the classification of post offices made on July 1, 1964. The first general reclassification under the revision made by this legislation will occur on July 1, 1965.

Section 501(b) of the conference substitute contains the same effective date, noon, January 3, 1965, for Members of Congress as contained in the House bill.

Section 501(c) of the conference substitute provides that the rates for officers and employees of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate shall not be increased above $22,000 per annum until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1965. The limitation in the conference substitute applies only to certain rates in title II of the bill and not to rates in other titles of the bill as did the House provision.

Section 501(d) of the conference substitute provides that, for the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an officer or employee is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (5 U.S.C. 2091–2103), all changes in rates of compensation which result from the enactment of the conference substitute shall be held and construed to be effective as of the date of enactment.

Section 502 of the conference substitute provides that, except for employees who died or retired during the retroactive period, the payment of retroactive compensation will be made only in the case of individuals in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment. Retroactive payment also would be made for services rendered during the retroactive period in the case of employees who retired or died during such period.

The conference substitute also provides that such retroactive compensation shall not be considered as basic compensation for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of any such retired or deceased officer or employee.

The House bill contained no provision similar to section 502 of the conference substitute.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ADDITIONAL PROGRAM

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce an addition to the program of the House.

The Committee on House Administration, tomorrow, will call up House Resolution 719 and House Resolution 800.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. MORRISON), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS), for today, tomorrow, and Wednesday, on account of illness.

Mr. WALLHAUSER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. LAIRD, for 15 minutes, tomorrow, August 4.

Mr HALPERN (at the request of Mr. SCHADEBERG), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. SCHADEBERG), for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HAYS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS.

Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter and that his remarks follow the remarks of Mr. ALBERT.

Mr. HALL after passing over H.R. 3800, Calendar No. 387 on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. WHITENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD following action on the bill H.R. 1096.

Mr. KASTENMEIER immediately preceding the vote on the military pay raise bill.

Mr. DOLE to extend his remarks following those of Mr. ASPINALL on H.R. 3071.

Mr. BETTS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in eight instances.

Mr. GILL (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately prior to the passage of S. 1991.

Mr. DORN and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHADEBERG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. WESTLAND.
Mr. DEL CLAWSON.
Mr. YOUNGER.
Mr. MOORE in three instances.
Mr. ROUDEBUSH.
Mr. CHENOWETH.
Mr. WYMAN in three instances.
Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.
Mr. TOLLEFSON in two instances.
Mr. LINDSAY in five instances.
Mr. HOSMER.
Mr. BATES.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PEPPER.
Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina in two instances.
Mr. ROGERS of Florida in eight instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ.
Mr. FULTON of Tennessee.
Mr. POWELL.
Mr. BURKHALTER.
Mr. RAINS in two instances.
Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.
Mr. WHITENER in four instances.
Mrs. HANSEN.
Mr. MORRIS.
Mr. MAHON.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman has said, but I would like to support a carefully written legislative standard. It seems to me that the standard here is altogether too general and leaves everything up to Mr. McNamara. There is no need for this looseness, particularly in view of the Secretary's manifest attitude toward public yards.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this is the death knell of the Government-owned shipyards. I have the Boston Navy Shipyard in my district. I have seen it go down from 11,000 to about 8,000. Here is a shipyard that is important. It is closest to the Atlantic Ocean and closest to Europe. An amendment of this type is indeed bad for the morale of the entire yard.

I hope the House will vote no in favor of the Federal shipyards.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. Speaker, I have always opposed the so-called 65/35 formula here under discussion, because it sets up an inflexible situation to the detriment of our Navy. The Senate amendment which we are now being asked to accept sets up an even more intolerable situation than that which was provided under the original House version. The Senate amendment provides that "at least 35 percentum" of the funds appropriated for the repair, alteration and conversion of naval vessels shall be allocated to privately owned shipyards. This means that the private shipyards are guaranteed a minimum allocation of 35 percent of all repair, alteration and conversion jobs, while the naval shipyards are without any guarantee. If we adopt the Senate amendment, we would be making it legally possible for the Secretary of Defense to allocate 100 percent of all repair, alteration and conversion work to private shipyards.

It appears that the private shipyard owners are no longer satisfied with 35 percent of the jobs, and its powerful lobby is flexing its muscles for a complete takeover. Concededly, private enterprise ought to be given its fair share of Government contracts, and I am not opposed to private enterprise. But where our Navy is concerned, our primary consideration should be directed toward what is best for our own national defense and security. Our Navy should not be saddled with inflexibility of the Senate amendment. Repair, alteration, or conversion of its vessels should be allowed wherever it can be done most efficiently and expeditiously, for the Navy is undeniably an emergency arm of our Nation which must be kept in constant readiness, if it is to be kept at all.

The incident only a few days ago in the Gulf of Tonkin in which the destroyer U.S.S. *Maddox* was the intended victim of an unannounced sneak attack illustrates this truth with dramatic force. The attack on the *Maddox* should serve to remind us that warfare invariably starts without any warning. Those of us who were in Hawaii when Pearl Harbor was bombed have not forgotten this. Let us be reminded by the *Maddox* incident that if it had not been for the efficient, dedicated team of Federal workers at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, our Navy would never have made the amazing recovery in the short time that it did. If our Navy is to be kept at all, it must be maintained at a level where it can meet any and all emergencies at any time. This it cannot do without a dependable, ever-ready crew of well trained, highly experienced repairmen at a readily accessible shipyard. Maintenance of our naval shipyards, such as the one at Pearl Harbor, therefore, must be considered as part and parcel of our Navy. To detract from this proposition is to weaken our Navy and endanger our own national security. The Senate amendment tends to do this and should be defeated.

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the point that the language in this conference report differs in no substantial way from the language already adopted by the House of Representatives in the original House bill; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 78, noes 84.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.

The House again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 101.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 178, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

YEAS—186

Abele	Bolton, Frances P.	Burke
Abernethy	Bolton, Oliver P.	Burleson
Anderson	Bonner	Burton, Utah
Andrews, Ala.	Bow	Byrnes, Wis.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brademas	Cahill
Arends	Bray	Casey
Ashbrook	Brock	Cederberg
Ayres	Bromwell	Chamberlain
Baker	Brooks	Chelf
Becker	Broomfield	Chenoweth
Beermann	Brotzman	Clancy
Belcher	Brown, Ohio	Cohelan
Bell	Broyhill, N.C.	Collier
Bennett, Fla.	Broyhill, Va.	Colmer
Berry	Bruce	Conte
Betts	Cunningham	Corbett
Boggs	Denton	Cramer
Boland	Derwinski	Curtis
Bolling	Devine	Daniel, Va.
Bolton, Carroll	Dole	Davis, Tenn.
	Dowdy	de la Garza
	Duncan	Dent
	Dwyer	Derounian
	Edmondson	Dingell
	Fallon	Donohue
	Fascell	Dorn
	Feighan	Downing
	Findley	Dulski
	Flynt	Edwards
	Fogarty	Elliott
	Ford	Everett
	Foreman	Farbstein
	Fountain	Fino
	Frelinghuysen	Fisher
	Fulton, Pa.	Flood
	Fuqua	Fraser
	Gary	Gallagher
	Giaimo	Gathings
	Gibbons	Gilbert
	Glenn	Gill
	Goodell	Gonzalez
	Goodling	Grant
	Grabowski	Gray
	Green, Oreg.	Green, Pa.
	Griffin	Grover
	Griffiths	Gubser
	Gross	Johansen
	Gurney	Jonas
	Hagen, Calif.	Kastenmeier
	Hall	Keith
	Halleck	Kilgore
	Hansen	King, Calif.
	Harrison	Kirwan
	Harsha	Knox
	Harvey, Ind.	Kornegay
	Hechler	Kunkel
	Hoeven	Kyl
	Horan	Laird
	Hutchinson	Langen
	Jarman	Latta
	Jensen	Lipscomb
		Long, Md.
		McClory
		McCulloch
		McLoskey
		MacGregor
		Mahon
		Martin, Calif.
		Martin, Nebr.
		Mathias
		Matthews
		May
		Meader
		Michel
		Miller, Calif.
		Mills
		Minshall
		Monagan
		Moore
		Morris
		Morton
		Mosher
		Natcher
		Nelsen
		O'Konski
		Ostertag
		Patman
		Pelly
		Perkins
		Pickle
		Pillion
		Poage
		Poff
		Quie
		Quillen
		Reid, Ill.
		Reifel
		Rhodes, Ariz.
		Rich
		Roberts, Tex.
		Rogers, Fla.
		Rogers, Tex.
		Roudebush
		Roush
		St Germain
		St. Onge
		Schadeberg
		Short
		Sibal
		Sickles
		Sikes
		Siler
		Smith, Calif.
		Smith, Iowa
		Snyder
		Springer
		Stafford
		Steed
		Stinson
		Stubblefield
		Taft
		Talcott
		Teague, Calif.
		Teague, Tex.
		Thomas
		Thompson, Tex.
		Thomson, Wis.
		Tuck
		Udall
		Ullman
		Utt
		Van Pelt
		Westland
		White
		Whitten
		Williams
		Wilson, Ind.
		Wright

NAYS—178

Abbitt	Hagan, Ga.	Olson, Minn.
Addabbo	Haley	O'Neill
Ashmore	Halpern	Osmers
Aspinall	Hanna	Patten
Auchincloss	Harding	Pepper
Baldwin	Hardy	Philbin
Barrett	Harris	Pike
Barry	Hawkins	Pilcher
Bates	Hays	Pirnie
Blatnik	Henderson	Price
Boland	Hollifield	Pucinski
Brown, Calif.	Horton	Reid, N.Y.
Burkhalter	Hosmer	Reuss
Burton, Calif.	Huddleston	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Jennings	Rivers, Alaska
Cameron	Joelson	Rivers, S.C.
Carey	Johnson, Calif.	Robison
Celler	Johnson, Pa.	Rodino
Clark	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Colo.
Clausen, Don H.	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, N.Y.
Clawson, Del	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Cleveland	Kelly	Roosevelt
Cooley	Keogh	Rosenthal
Corman	King, N.Y.	Rostenkowski
Curtin	Kluczynski	Roybal
Daddario	Leggett	Ryan, N.Y.
Dague	Libonati	St. George
Daniels	Lindsay	Saylor
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Schenck
Dawson	McDade	Schneebeli
Delaney	McDowell	Schweiker
Dent	McFall	Secrest
Derounian	McIntire	Selden
Donohue	McMillan	Senner
Dorn	Macdonald	Sisk
Downing	Madden	Slack
Dulski	Mailliard	Smith, Va.
Edwards	Marsh	Staggers
Elliott	Martin, Mass.	Stephens
Everett	Matsunaga	Stratton
Farbstein	Milliken	Sullivan
Fino	Minish	Taylor
Fisher	Montoya	Thompson, N.J.
Flood	Moorhead	Tollefson
Fraser	Morgan	Trimble
Gallagher	Morrison	Tupper
Gathings	Morse	Tuten
Gilbert	Moss	Van Deerlin
Gill	Multer	Vanik
Gonzalez	Murphy, Ill.	Vinson
Grant	Murphy, N.Y.	Waggonner
Gray	Murray	Watson
Green, Pa.	O'Brien, N.Y.	Watts
Grover	O'Hara, Ill.	Weltner
Gubser	O'Hara, Mich.	Whalley
	Olsen, Mont.	Wharton

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Whitener	Wilson, Charles H.	Wyman
Wickersham	Winstead	Young
Widnall	Wydler	Younger
Willis		Zablocki

NOT VOTING—67

Adair	Garmatz	Pool
Albert	Harvey, Mich.	Powell
Alger	Healey	Purcell
Ashley	Hébert	Rains
Avery	Herlong	Randall
Baring	Hoffman	Riehlman
Bass	Holland	Roberts, Ala.
Battin	Hull	Rumsfeld
Beckworth	Ichord	Ryan, Mich.
Bennett, Mich.	Jones, Mo.	Schwengel
Boggs	Karsten	Scott
Bolling	Kee	Sheppard
Buckley	Kilburn	Shipley
Curtis	Landrum	Shriver
Davis, Tenn.	Lankford	Skubitz
Diggs	Lennon	Staebler
Dingell	Lesinski	Thompson, La.
Ellsworth	Lloyd	Toll
Evins	Miller, N.Y.	Wallhauser
Finnegan	Nedzi	Weaver
Forrester	Nix	Wilson, Bob
Friedel	Norblad	
Fulton, Tenn.	Passman	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Toll against.
Mr. Lankford for, with Mr. Nix against.
Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Karsten against.
Mr. Beckworth for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Alger for, with Mr. Riehlman against.
Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Weaver against.
Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Wallhauser against.
Mr. Schwengel for, with Mrs. Kee against.
Mr. Shriver for, with Mr. Healey against.
Mr. Skubitz for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
Mr. Battin for, with Mr. Finnegan against.
Mr. Rumsfeld for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Albert with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Ryan of Michigan.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Bass.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Staebler.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Nedzi.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. COOLEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. AYRES changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members speaking on the conference report and the motion just agreed to be permitted to extend their remarks thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930, FREE IMPORTATION OF WILD ANIMALS AND WILD BIRDS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 3, 1964.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11049, an act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, passed the House on June 12, 1964, and was amended in the other body.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment.

The conference substitute fully effects the purposes of the House bill. These purposes are first, to comply partially with the mandate, laid down by the Congress in Public Law 87–793, that postal and other Federal career employees shall be paid salaries comparable to salaries paid workers in private enterprise for comparable levels of responsibility, skill, and performance, and second, to partially remedy the serious inadequacies in the Federal executive, congressional, and judicial salary structure. The conference report is unanimous and is signed by all conferees on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate. I hope the conference report will be approved.

The conference substitute grants postal and other career employees salary increases as provided in the House bill, but corrects an inequity with respect to the salaries of employees in the middle salary grades. It guarantees a minimum 3-percent increase for grades GS–9 through GS–12 of the Classification Act, whereas increases in these grades were as low as 1.6 percent in the House bill. A similar minimum will apply with respect to two salary increases for other categories of employees covered by the bill.

The conference substitute also provides a new salary scale for postmasters in fourth-class post offices granting increases for these postmasters which are more in line with increases for other employees than provided by the House bill. These postmasters will receive increases ranging from 10 percent in the highest group of offices to 15 percent in the lower levels.

The conference substitute extends to all levels of postal field service employees annual step increases through the first seven automatic salary steps, whereas under present law only those postal employees in the lowest six salary levels receive such annual increases. The House bill would have continued the existing automatic step increase provisions—that is, they would have been limited to the first six salary levels.

Other changes made by the conference substitute in the House bill include, first, a requirement for Civil Service Commission approval of any proposed new appointment to a Classification Act position at higher than the initial salary step; second, omission of the exemption from certain limitations of the Classification Act for supergrade positions concerned with research and development in the physical and natural sciences and medicine; third, the fixing of a maximum limitation of 249 hearing examiner positions at grades 16 and 17 which are exempt from the existing aggregate numerical limitation on all supergrade position; and fourth, the inclusion of a provision of the Senate amendment increasing the allowance to former Presidents for staff salaries by $15,000.

The conference substitute contains the provisions of the House bill for adjustment of salary rates of House officers and employees, and adds the provisions of the Senate amendment providing salary adjustments for Senate officers and employees.

The conference substitute provides a salary for the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States of $28,500, the same as the salary for executive salary level III in the Senate amendment and the conference substitute. The House bill provided a salary of $29,000 for such executive level III and for the Assistant Comptroller General.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Similarly, the conference substitute provides salaries of $27,000—equal to the salary rate for executive level IV for the general counsel of the General Accounting Office, the Librarian of Congress, the Public Printer, and the Architect of the Capitol. The House bill provided salaries of $28,000 equal to the executive salary level IV of the House bill, for these positions.

The salaries of the Deputy Public Printer, the Deputy Librarian of Congress, and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol are fixed at $25,500 by the conference substitute, representing a compromise between the House bill figure of $27,000 and the Senate amendment figure of $24,500. A related compromise places the salary of the Second Assistant Architect of the Capitol at $23,500 in the conference substitute, in lieu of the $26,000 in the House bill and the $22,500 in the Senate bill.

The conference substitute adopts the five executive salary levels and the salaries for such levels provided in the Senate amendment. The salary for Cabinet officers—executive level I—is $35,000, or $2,500 more than provided in the House bill. The salary for executive level II is $30,000, as in both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The salaries for executive levels III, IV, and V are $28,500, $27,000, and $26,000, respectively, compared to $29,000, $28,000, and $27,000 in the House bill.

The conference substitute makes specific position assignments to all five executive levels, as in the Senate amendment, whereas the House bill made such specific assignments only for the highest three levels and authorized the President to place such positions as he might deem proper in executive levels IV, V, and VI—with level VI of the House bill omitted from the conference substitute. Since the Senate amendment made a number of specific position assignments to executive levels IV and V but did not make such specific assignments for certain other positions which have been recommended for executive levels, and in view of the "open-end" authorization in the House bill for the President to place positions in the executive levels IV and below, the conference substitute contains a compromise between the House bill and the Senate amendment provisions in this respect by authorizing the President to place positions held but not to exceed 60 persons in executive levels IV and V.

The conference substitute also makes certain changes in the assignment of positions to executive levels II, III, and IV, for which differing specific assignments among such levels were made in the House bill and the Senate amendment. These few positions are listed on page 46 of the statement of managers.

The conference substitute adopts the salary rates provided by the Senate amendment for officers and judges of the District of Columbia—which are $1,000 below the House bill salaries in each case—except that it contains the House bill salaries for the Superintendent and the Deputy Superintendent of Schools, the Fire Chief, and the Chief of Police.

The conference substitute provides a salary of $40,000 for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and of $39,500 for the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. This is $3,000 less than the salaries provided in the House bill, but $2,000 more than the salaries provided by the Senate amendment. The salaries of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, the Deputy Director, and the Commissioners of the Court of Claims are fixed at $27,000, $26,000, and $26,000, respectively—or $1,000 below the House figures in each case. As in the case of the legislative officers mentioned earlier, these adjusted salary rates are keyed to appropriate executive salary rates in the conference substitute.

The conference substitute does not include title V contained in the House bill, which would have provided for automatic future adjustments of salary rates for Members of Congress and Federal executives and judges in conformity with future increases in Classification Act salary rates.

The conference substitute makes all salary increases provided therein effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1964, except that the salary adjustments for Members of Congress will take effect at noon on January 3, 1965. However, as is necessary and customary where retroactive salary increases are granted, for the purpose of fixing the amount of group life insurance the new salary rates are held to be effective as of date of enactment. Similarly, the retroactive salary increase will be paid generally only to employees on the rolls on the date of enactment, except that it will be paid to anyone who retired during the retroactive period for services actually rendered after the effective date and up to retirement date. The retroactive increase will not be considered basic salary for Retirement Act purposes in the case of such retirees.

The effect of these special limitations with respect to the retroactive part of the salary increases will take place in every instance at a point of time between the effective date of July 1, 1964, as provided by the Senate amendment, and the effective date of the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after date of enactment as provided in the House bill. There can be no question of their propriety in the conference substitute as an adjustment between the provisions of the House bill and of the Senate amendment relating to the time the new salaries shall be effective.

Mr. Speaker, I have summarized all of the differences of any considerable importance between the House bill and the conference substitute. I hope that the conference substitute will be approved.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge defeat of the conference report on H.R. 11049.

At the outset, I remind the House that once this year we had the gumption to defeat the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1964.

On March 12, the House rejected the earlier version of this bill by a substantial 222-to-184 vote. We could do it again today. We ought to do it.

I have just one observation to offer at this juncture. I offer it not only for such consideration as my colleagues are willing to give it here and now, but also for such consideration as the taxpayers of America may wish to give our action today when they go into the voting booths on November 3.

I propose to speak briefly about integration—not the kind of integration that has been the subject of national controversy for the past decade, but integrated inflation.

I respectfully point out that what we are doing today represents one more step in the chain reaction procedure whereby we are tying the Federal salary and employee benefit policies and, indeed, the entire Federal fiscal policy into the total inflationary process in this country.

Wage and salary scales in private industry are tied into the cost-of-living index—largely through the escalation clauses of collective bargaining contracts.

Through adoption of the ill-advised comparability principle, we have tied the Federal wage and salary scales into the private industry wage and salary scale.

Through the Udall amendment, it was proposed to tie in congressional salaries through a scheme of automatic increases with any increases made hereafter in the Federal salary scale. I recognize that this noxious provision has been deleted in conference, but I predict that it will be back.

Furthermore, we ought not to forget that the cost of Federal employee fringe benefits is likewise tied in automatically with the salary and wage increases.

This fact, which receives little, if any, consideration when this House votes further salary and wage increases for Federal employees, has become so significant that it occasioned a timely comment the other day by Mr. Joseph Young, who writes "The Federal Spotlight" column in the Washington Star. Mr. Young pointed out that the cost of Government employee fringe benefits has mounted to 23 percent of total payroll—and that is additional to the Federal payroll.

Mr. Young further pointed out that this 23 percent added cost of fringe benefits amounts to some $3.5 billion in additional annual costs, over and above the $15 billion annual Federal payroll.

And Mr. Young further pointed out, quite correctly, that "every time Government salaries are increased, the value of the employees' fringe benefits is raised with a resultant increase in cost to the Government."

If we adopt this conference report today, we are repeating that process.

My point is that the net result of this integrated inflation is a progressive loss of control by the Congress and the American taxpayer over both the damaging processes of inflation and over the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

mounting costs of Federal Government.

Let me observe in passing that there is one all-important difference between the economics of mass production in private industry and the economics of burgeoning Federal Government.

In private industry, mass production can reduce unit costs. On the other hand, there is no equivalent or corresponding reduction in unit cost incident to the massive expansion of the bureaucracy.

Last week I voted against the social security amendments on the grounds that it further ties the social security program into the inflationary cycle. An opponent back home said my vote "just doesn't make any sense."

I suppose by the same standards of fiscal irresponsibility accepted by my opponent, "it just doesn't make any sense" to vote against this pay bill.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the only thing that does make any sense is a desperation effort to put the brake on fiscal policies which make control of inflation progressively difficult, if not impossible.

We have the opportunity today to take a major step in this direction by rejecting this conference report.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

(Mr. DANIELS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the amendment recommended in the conference report on H.R. 11049 will accomplish a complete overhaul of the salaries in the executive branch. Also it will help bring the salaries of other Federal Government personnel up to date. I would like to reiterate, if I may, a few of the most important aspects of this legislation.

In 1962, Congress made the commitment to our classified and postal Federal employees, numbering approximately 2 million, that their wages would be comparable to those in private enterprise. We did this so that they would not be penalized economically for their decision to serve the Federal Government. The conference report before us today will determine whether Congress intends to abide by this commitment.

Before the comparability principle was introduced, during the period from 1945 to 1960 a haphazard approach to Federal salaries resulted in seven increases which averaged 4.1 percent annual increases for classified employees and 4.9 percent annual increases for postal employees.

The Members of Congress, the high appointive offices in the executive branch, and the Federal judiciary, collectively and individually, have an immense responsibility. The welfare and very survival of every American rests on the soundness of their decisions. In all other areas of American life, those who are held accountable for important and far-reaching decisions are paid salaries commensurate with their responsibilities. It seems only fair that this should also be the case in the Federal Government.

Each member of the board of directors of most major corporations in the United States are paid salaries upward of $40,000 per year. Yet the members of the board of directors of the Nation's largest business, the Congress, receive $22,500 per year. A sampling of 1,157 firms showed that the median salary for the highest officer was $91,000 per year, yet a Federal Cabinet officer who heads a concern larger than most of the firms in that study receives only $25,000 per year and will receive $35,000 under this proposal. Even officials of many of the larger States receive more than that.

In these positions of great responsibility, it is fallacious to assume that economy will result from paying salaries less than could be obtained elsewhere. These are positions in which we must have qualified administrators and decisionmakers. Yet many of the qualified people appointed to these jobs find that they simply cannot afford to keep them; consequently, they resign. It is false economy to maintain the compensation of the most important and critical Government offices at such a level that only the rich can afford them. One of the objections raised earlier to this bill was that it is not economical—the biggest economy we can accomplish is to pay salaries commensurate with responsibilities and duties, so that highly qualified people can afford to hold them.

The advantageous effects of this legislation will be great, not only with respect to the highest offices in all three branches of the Government, but in the lower grades and levels as well. The salary structure that we are about to adopt will respond better to the present-day needs of the Government than the system presently in effect, and it will facilitate the recruitment of a high caliber of personnel from top to bottom.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11049 received extensive consideration by the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of both the House and the Senate. The few changes made in the House bill by the conferees were, on the whole, quite fair, and resulted in several improvements. This bill is much needed and long overdue. I hope the Members of this great body will join with me in voting for it again today.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I must again rise in protest to the passage of this unnecessary and unjustified pay increase for Members of Congress.

I say unnecessary and unjustified for I sincerely believe it is a mistake to approve this legislation at this time, regardless of the merit which some Members may feel the legislation contains.

This legislation means that in the course of the last 10 years the Congress will have increased its salary by 140 percent—from $12,500 in 1954 to $30,000 in 1965. We are all thankful that the cost of living has not risen by proportionate leaps and bounds. Had the expenses of the average American increased to that extent within that period we would be undergoing severe economic problems.

It is for this reason that I believe we should oppose the conference report for this further pay increase. One of our chief objectives should be to direct economic forces so as to avoid inflation. Inflation can destroy the value of the dollar, and is especially damaging to retired persons living on their savings, pensions, and social security payments.

The ultimate effects of runaway inflation would be hard to foretell, but we know it could cause great damage to untold millions of Americans.

The House rejected this pay legislation on March 12, but, at the insistence of President Johnson, it was revived.

As for the necessity of increases to various classes of Federal Government employees, such increases should have been considered on their own, and not all tied together with huge raises for the Congress, the Cabinet, and the courts.

I spoke against this congressional increase and voted against it when it was before the House in March and June, and I repeat my opposition at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this conference report but I cannot help but comment that it seems unfortunate that the conferees did not see fit to restore the Supreme Court salary ratio to what it had been as passed in the House bill. The compromise between the House and the Senate, it seems to me, leaves nobody satisfied. I hope that at some future date, and a date not too far distant, the salary positions of the Supreme Court Justices may achieve the parity which I believe they require in our form of government.

The rest of the bill, Mr. Speaker, achieves two fundamental objectives: First, it brings the great body of governmental employees more in line with the pay scales of those in private employment. Second, it makes it more possible for the Executive to attract effective capable private citizens for important public service. The public is well served by this legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, which as I pointed out the other day, has been before us since May of 1963, has been worked, reworked, debated, argued over, discussed by all the newspapers and commentators and eventually now we reached the point where the conferees met on this bill. We had an exceedingly fine meeting with the managers on the part of the Senate. We were able to compromise differences. We were able to come out with language which we believe is just as fair as the boundaries of the two bills would possibly permit.

Having done this, we recognize that in every piece of salary legislation or any reclassification act, there are areas or individuals that have not received an equitable increase or equitable treatment.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

These things can only be corrected by later legislation.

It is assumed on the basis of existing law that it is required that Federal employees be kept at comparable salary levels with people in private industry and we will have an opportunity to correct any inequities that may become evident.

It is also true with regard to a number of individuals who are members of commissions and boards and who are in the executive offices that we had no latitude within which to work and consequently we gave that power in the handling of some 60 positions to the Executive.

I believe, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we now, with the House having voted by a clear majority for the revised bill, with the Senate having voted it by a clear majority, and with the conferees having agreed unanimously that this conference report can be upheld and that it can be voted for. I think that when we have done this, we will have taken a very long and very proper step toward creating the comparability that has become the guiding policy regarding Federal salaries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the conference report be voted up favorably. I express the hope that since this is an administration bill strongly backed by the President that it will soon be enacted into law and that our employees will begin to receive the benefits of this very fine piece of legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. It is completely beyond my comprehension how the Members of Congress, through another pay bill, can with any conscience, add another half-billion dollars to the huge debt and deficit of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill, and to the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. May I ask the gentleman in return, if he opposed the military pay raise bill yesterday which is the second one brought in since October of 1963.

Mr. GROSS. No; I did not oppose the military pay bill yesterday. I did not oppose the bill that was passed a few months ago.

If the gentleman will permit me to make one other observation, the military has lagged behind the civilian payroll for a long time. I am sure the gentleman will agree to that.

Mr. CORBETT. I certainly will agree to that and I will agree further that the gentleman from Iowa has made a very sincere and lengthy opposition to this bill.

For those who agree with him, I believe the gentleman should be complimented on his efforts. I hope he will return the compliments to the committee and to the majority of the House and Senate, who have worked just as hard and just as sincerely for passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this conference report and enactment of this legislation is apparently a foregone conclusion.

That the bill will be signed by President Johnson is also a foregone conclusion. Despite the fact that the same Lyndon Johnson has called on private industry and labor to hold the line on prices and wages, he will now, and with the greatest of ease, sign this legislation giving lavish pay increases of 33 percent and more to members of Congress and others in the executive and judicial branches of Government.

As I have repeatedly stated, this bill will add a minimum of $540 million to the debt and deficit of the Federal Government and further fuel the fire of inflation that is steadily eroding the value of the dollar.

It is entirely fitting, in view of Lyndon Johnson's high pressure support for this bill, that on tomorrow the House will begin debate on the same Lyndon Johnson's politically inspired war on poverty bill.

The premium in Washington continues to be on extravagance in the operation of the Federal Government and on double talk.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Members of the House will stand and be counted on the final vote today on the biggest single pay raise ever approved in the history of this country.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report, but I share the concern of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. I believe it is a disservice to ourselves to treat the Supreme Court in this manner. We limit their salary increase to slightly more than half of our own, to express the disagreement of some Members with some of their decisions. I sincerely hope that the next Congress will right this wrong.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlemen from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT and Mr. CORMAN]. When we engage in an act of vengeance because we do not agree with certain decisions of the Supreme Court we are setting a very, very dangerous precedent, because in effect we are saying to the members of the Court, "If you do not decide cases the way we believe, we will engage in reprisals against you." I believe this is dangerous and could boomerang. I regret the action that was taken to accomplish that end.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. As chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, I should like to ask the gentleman from Arizona a question. I am quite concerned about section 308, the limitation on salaries lxed by administrative action. Can the gentleman tell me whether the Panama Canal Company was inadvertently omitted from the exemption on limitation?

Mr. UDALL. I believe my good friend has probably spotted the reason for the provision to which she takes exception. I talked to the conferees. Apparently, the authority for the Panama Canal Company to fix rates of compensation was not included in the exemptions listed in section 308. There is an exemption for the Central Intelligence Agency, the TVA, and certain other agencies.

Since neither the bill passed by the House nor the bill passed by the Senate had any provision for the Panama Canal Company, there was nothing to compromise, and this oversight could not be corrected even though located and designated.

I say to my friend that there is nothing we can do at this late date. I believe the leaders on both sides of the aisle in our committee feel the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company should have this authority. If such legislation is sponsored, I, for one, will support it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I hope so. There is nothing we can do in respect to this bill?

Mr. UDALL. We were advised by legal counsel, by the Parliamentarian, that there was nothing to compromise. Neither the House nor the Senate had passed any provision of that kind. There was nothing on which an agreement could be worked out. The authority the gentlewoman desires should be provided. Most members of our committee, I believe, are in agreement. I believe this is a subject for corrective legislation.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. I hope it will be done.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEOGH. I wonder if the gentleman would explain to the House for the RECORD how the oversight took place in connection with the treatment of the Executive Director of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which I understand is a position which has not been accorded the same treatment given comparable positions.

Mr. UDALL. The conferees dealt with literally dozens of these executive positions. I am told by the staff that this was a matter of judgment and was a compromise. I hope we can get a further explanation for the distinguished gentleman. There were a number of agency heads and appointees who were not particularly happy with the way they came out under this bill.

Mr. KEOGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred-fifteen Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 202]

Alger	Hébert	Purcell
Ashley	Herlong	Randall
Auchincloss	Hoffman	Roberts, Ala.
Avery	Hull	Rodino
Baring	Ichord	Rogers, Colo.
Bass	Jones, Mo.	Rumsfeld
Battin	Karsten	Ryan, Mich.
Beckworth	Kee	St Germain
Bennett, Mich.	Kilburn	Schwengel
Bolling	Lankford	Scott
Buckley	Leggett	Sheppard
Celler	Lennon	Shipley
Curtis	Lesinski	Shriver
Davis, Tenn.	Lloyd	Skubitz
Diggs	McCulloch	Thompson, La.
Dingell	Miller, N.Y.	Toll
Evins	Moore	Vinson
Finnegan	Moss	Wallhauser
Fulton, Tenn.	Nedzi	Watson
Gill	Norblad	Weaver
Harvey, Mich.	Passman	Widnall
Healey	Powell	Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). On this rollcall 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

[Mr. UDALL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 1 minute?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if that Democrat leader to whom the gentleman referred is the same leader of those on the other side of the aisle who has called upon the private business fraternity to hold the line on wages and prices.

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman will yield, I hope that everyone will be in the mainstream. We can all be in the mainstream and stand together on this.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean the Lyndon Johnson mainstream that calls upon private industry to hold the line on wages and prices while supporting a lush salary grab for Members of Congress and others?

Mr. UDALL. I was suggesting the Johnson-Goldwater mainstream on Federal pay.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not need to bring Mr. GOLDWATER into this situation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The question is on the conference report.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and seventy-seven Members are present, a quorum.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECURITIES ACTS AMENDMENTS OF 1964

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 801, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6793) to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualification and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

After the passage of H.R. 6793, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, S. 1642; and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 6793 as passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]; and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of H.R. 6793. This is a bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 as amended.

In 1961 the Congress directed the Securities and Exchange Commission to make a study of conditions on the various stock exchanges. After a 2-year study they came up with certain recommendations which are incorporated in this proposal.

The purpose is to protect the investing public. There are two main features. One is to extend to investors in certain over-the-counter securities the same protection now afforded to those in listed securities by providing that the issuers of certain securities now traded over the counter shall be subject to the same requirements that now apply to issuers of securities listed on the main exchanges.

The entire bill has for its purpose the protection of those who invest in securities. I know of no opposition to the rule. It is an open rule and provides that it shall be in order, following the passage of this bill, to consider the Senate bill, S. 1642, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the House-passed bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] has explained, House Resolution 801 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 6793, a bill from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce introduced for the purpose of amending the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

The rule provides 2 hours of general debate, following which the amendment adopted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be considered as an original bill which will be open for debate and amendment under the 5-minute rule.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] has explained, the bill would put into effect a number of changes and a number of new recommendations concerning the activities and the work of the Securities and Exchange Commission. It will amend the Securities Act to provide that the issuers of certain securities now traded over the counter shall be subject to the same requirements that now apply to the issuers of securities listed on any stock exchange of record; and also to strengthen the qualifications, standards, and disciplinary controls of those engaged in the over-the-counter market business.

I think this bill is long overdue. It is designed for the purpose of protecting investors who purchase various stocks and bonds, mostly stocks over the counter, in the same way that they are now protected as to other issues purchased that are listed on the regular stock exchanges that are so well known to most of us.

Certain classes of stocks are specifically exempted from these requirements. As a whole the bill would strengthen the regulation of the over-the-counter brokers and dealers, including qualifications standards and disciplinary controls, by

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ified immediately by exempting Canada to offset the Canadian crisis which cost that country $225 million in 1 day. The Japanese market, which received one of the worst setbacks in its history has not been able to recover from it. One witness who is an expert on business in Japan testified that the threatened tax inhibited Japan's growth during the past year. Prosperity in other countries raises the standard of living as well as prices. Such increases result in more imports from the United States and more competitive prices, and thus are favorable factors in our efforts to eliminate the deficit. There is a very close correlation between private investment abroad and our exports.

This measure imposes rigidities on our capital markets and capital flow that will be of lasting and perhaps irreparable harm. . Our foreign trade position can only be weakened by these rigidities. It would be much more desirable and satisfactory to have flexibility in dealing with exports of capital if it is determined that some direct control is needed.

The bill would make it prohibitive to make desirable portfolio changes thus leading to deterioration in the quality of American-owned foreign securities. The very minimum that should be provided is that securities presently owned by Americans could be exchanged or switched for other foreign securities without being subject to the tax. This would have no effect on the balance of payments as far as an outflow of capital is concerned and if the changes resulted in more desirable securities in American portfolios, a favorable result would accrue to the United States. But this proposal was rejected by the Treasury.

This bill represents an attempt to control interest rates and credit through the U.S. Treasury rather than through the Fedeal Reserve Board, which has been given the responsibility and authority of regulating interest and credit. The Treasury is far more subject to political pressure than is the more independent Federal Reserve.

This bill requires security firms, the very ones that are harmed by it, to shoulder the additional burden of auditing all sales made since July of 1963 as provided for in the retroactive bill. This must be done manually at great cost. The temporary nature of the measure does not seem to justify all of the complications and expenses that would result from its enactment, even if it were successful in stemming the outflow of capital.

Foreigners have expressed concern that if the United States is resigned to measures such as this, bringing our free market to an end, it marks only the beginning of further controls in the future. I am inclined to agree that if we once give up the freedom which we now have in our financial markets, it will never be returned, but that a gradual management from Government administrative agencies will continue to encroach upon the free market.

It has been argued that if we do not pass this measure, foreigners will feel that the United States is not serious about doing away with the balance-of-payments deficit. I cannot agree with such sentiment. We cannot impress them with temporary stopgap measures. If we are to preserve the confidence in the dollar which is so necessary to avoid call upon our gold, we must show our determination to correct the causes of the payment imbalance.

Even the Secretary of the Treasury was forced to admit that the long-term effect of this unwise legislation will be adverse to our balance-of-payments position. That is precisely why the tax imposed by the bill was described by administration spokesmen as "temporary." In my opinion, any possible short-term benefits will be outweighed by both the short-term and by the longrun harm that the bill will cause.

For all of these reasons, I shall vote against passage of the bill, as I voted against its adoption in the Finance Committee, and hope that it will be defeated by the Senate.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS REPORTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, Telecommunications Reports, which is frequently referred to as the bible of the nonbroadcast communications field, is celebrating its 30th aniversary on August 9.

This weekly news publication, edited since the beginning by Roland C. Davies, was started a few months after the formation of the Federal Communications Commission in 1934.

It now is subscribed to by virtually every organization in the United States with an interest in common carrier communications, as well as companies or administrations in every major nation of the world.

On July 30, the FCC wrote to Mr. Davies, congratulating him on his 30 years of service as editor and publisher, and commending him for "reliable and complete coverage of the telecommunications field."

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from FCC Chairman E. William Henry printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1964.

Mr. ROLAND C. DAVIES,
Editor-Publisher, Telecommunications Reports, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DAVIES: Telecommunications Reports reaches its 30th anniversary on August 9. This is an event which should not pass without a note of recognition from the Federal Communications Commission for the important contribution made by Telecommunications Reports in the dissemination of news and information relating to the communications common carrier field and other nonbroadcast communications.

In your weekly reporting of significant activities, developments, and issues relating to these fields, you have demonstrated consistent standards of accuracy and completeness. You have chronicled the actions taken by the Federal Communications Commission, State regulatory commissions, other Government agencies, the Congress, and the communications industry.

By such reliable and complete coverage of the telecommunications field, your publication has provided the Commission and its staff with a constant source of current information which has greatly facilitated the performance of our regulatory responsibilities.

As editor and publisher of Telecommunications Reports during its entire lifetime, you deserve to take pride in the contributions you have made to this important field, and the Commission joins with me in extending sincere congratulations. It is with regret that we have heard of your recent illness and we wish to extend our very best wishes for your speedy recovery.

Yours sincerely,

E. WILLIAM HENRY,
Chairman.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Davies has been ill recently, and we in this field, as well as the committees of Congress in the communications field, wish him a speedy recovery. We join in the congratulations to him by Chairman Henry of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 3, 1964, pp. 17267–17279, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I announce that the conference report was signed by all the conferees. I commend the conferees on the part of the Senate. This was the most friendly conference that I have ever attended. We had no trouble reaching a conclusion in connection with the conference report.

I can safely say that the House yielded to the Senate in about 75 percent of the cases. That is true all the way through the conference report.

Madam President, I am very pleased to report that the conferees readily reached agreement on a compromise bill not substantially different from the Senate ver-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

sion. On many points at issue, the Senate positions were accepted by the conferees as representing either more recent recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget or a general consolidation of thinking arising out of the debate on the floor of the Senate when the bill was passed. On other points, reasonable compromises between Senate and House versions were reached without major disagreement.

The salary amounts set for executive positions by the Senate bill were sustained in conference, as was the establishment of five levels of executive compensation with positions listed for each level.

The compensation schedule for employees under the Classification Act as it appeared in the Senate version, with increases up to 3 percent for the four middle-management grades, was agreed upon.

A compromise figure in the salaries prescribed for Supreme Court Justices was reached.

The Senate schedule of compensation for postmasters of fourth-class post offices was adopted and the conferees approved the Senate provision which extends to all levels of the postal field service schedule annual step increases up to step 7.

With regard to the maximum salary figure for employees of the Congress, the sense of the Senate as expressed in the debate on this measure was to the effect that each body should establish its own top figure. The conferees agreed to this, so that in the compromise bill separate figures establish these congressional maximums.

Salary scales for certain officers of the legislative branch differed slightly in the original Senate and House versions. A compromise approximately splitting the difference was agreed to in the conference substitute bill.

The Senate decision to strike the Udall amendment, which provided that congressional pay increases would automatically go into effect in percentage amounts related to pay increases for the executive branch, was sustained.

The conferees accepted the amendment of the Senate which struck out the Udall amendment.

The Senate amendment making available additional funds to provide pay increases for the staffs of former Presidents was also approved in the conference bill.

The position level and corresponding salary for some 14 executive positions differed somewhat in the House and Senate versions. The relative importance of each of these positions was carefully considered in conference and reasonable compromises were agreed to.

Since the enactment of the bill in the Senate, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has received a number of recommendations for alterations and additions in the placement of certain executive positions in the executive salary schedule. It was my view that these changes, some of them proposed by Members of the Senate, should be considered in conference and agreed upon. Since assuring some of my colleagues that such would be the case, I had been told that if these changes were considered and agreed to in conference, they would be subject in the House of Representatives to a point of order, thus providing a means by which final approval of this important measure would have been delayed.

Aware of this fact at the final conference meeting, the conferees agreed not to subject the compromise bill to such a delay. In order to permit any needed changes in the executive salary schedule, the conferees agreed to insert language authorizing the President to place an additional 30 persons, for a total of 60, in levels IV and V of the executive salary schedules.

In my view and I believe in the view of all six conferees, the conference bill is a good bill which goes a long way toward meeting the urgent salary needs of the Federal Government.

Madam President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

Madam President, the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] called me and said that he expected to be in the Chamber in a few minutes, but that if he were not present, not to hold up action on the conference report, and that he would submit a statement fully approving the report.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I compliment the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina for his able chairmanship of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and for the able manner in which he steered the bill through the committee and the Senate. Likewise, I compliment him for his service as chairman of the Senate conferees in the joint conference between the Senate and the House. I also congratulate the conferees of both the Senate and the House upon the agreement they have reached. In its present form, the bill resolves the issues between the Senate and the House in the most appropriate way that could be done.

Within a matter of hours the Federal employees pay bill of 1964 will be enacted. I regret that it has taken so long to reach the end of the road with respect to this important measure. Our dedicated postal workers and Federal employees had every right to expect its enactment long ago. Nonetheless, they have been most patient and understanding of the problems that had to be overcome before the measure could be finally enacted into law. I appreciate their patience and understanding.

First, I congratulate the conferees on the part of both the Senate and House on the agreement reached. The measure in its present form resolves the issues involved in a most appropriate manner. The bill, when finally enacted, will remove many existing inequities and provide a more nearly adequate basis of computation for the men and women who faithfully perform their assigned duties.

There is one note of particular interest in the measure. There are some who would downgrade the power of the press. I am not one of those who do this. Many months ago one of Washington's most outstanding reporters dealing primarily with Federal employee matters pointed out how $10 million could be saved annually without imposing an inequity on any employee. The writer to whom I refer is John Cramer, a likeable and very effective reporter for the Washington Daily News.

In a column addressed to the President of the United States, Mr. Cramer suggested that in writing the pay bill, Congress should amend the current law so as to provide for the computation of rates of pay in full cents by rounding off the fractions to the nearest penny. This seemingly simple idea had not been previously proposed. According to the computations by the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget, the adoption of this proposal will result in a saving to the taxpayers of $10 million annually. I am happy to say that this proposal is embodied in the pay measure. I congratulate Mr. Cramer for bringing this proposal to the attention of Congress, and I commend Congress for adopting it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his remarks concerning me. I thank every member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for their hard work during the hearings and for the help they have given throughout the proceedings on this bill. I have never seen a group of Democrats and Republicans work together better than we have worked on this bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is it in order at this time to move to reject the conference report; and would such a motion take precedence over the motion that is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. A majority vote is required to adopt the conference report.

Mr. ALLOTT. Do I correctly understand that a motion to reject the conference report is in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote against the motion to agree to the conference report would serve the same purpose.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I wish to address myself to this subject for a few minutes. I hope Senators will bear with me. I do not intend to speak at great length, but I believe a few things ought to be said about the conference report.

I am sure the conference was friendly, because one of the most significant things that the Senate did with respect to the pay bill was not attended to assiduously by the conferees. That was the item concerning salaries of the members of the Supreme Court.

When the bill came from the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it provided for a salary of $43,000 for Justices of the Supreme Court and

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

a salary of $43,500 for the Chief Justice of the United States. By an amendment that was offered by the senior Senator from Colorado and agreed to by a vote of 46 to 40, those amounts were reduced to $38,000 and $38,500, respectively. From the temper of the Senate that night and the remarks that took place at the time, I feel certain that an amendment not to increase the salaries of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices at all would have carried, and carried to the same extent.

Since the time I offered that amendment, I have read a number of editorials and articles attributing all sorts of motives and reasons for that action. I suppose that is what a person in public life should expect.

We are all free to agree or disagree with the decisions of the Supreme Court. That has nothing to do with the situation. Fifty percent of the litigants in every lawsuit are disappointed and will continue to be disappointed. I was careful at that time, and I am careful now, not to base anything I say on any of the decisions, wise or poor, divided or unanimous, that the Supreme Court has rendered in the past few years.

I said that night, and I say now, that there is no justification for a $10,000 differential between the salaries of the members of the Supreme Court and Members of Congress.

Members of the Supreme Court do not have to maintain two homes, sometimes three. They do not have to travel back to their constituencies 10, 12, or even 20 times a year. They do not have constituents to entertain in Washington. They are not burdened with a hundred other expenses that Members of the Senate and House must bear constantly.

Members of the Supreme Court do not stand for election every 2 years, as in the case of Members of the House, or every 6 years, as in the case of Members of the Senate. When one decides to stand for election to the Senate, he must burn all his bridges behind him, including his career. The voters of his State may, in their own wise discretion, terminate the relationship and chop it off in 1 short day. Then the defeated candidate must start his career all over again.

Furthermore, when a Supreme Court Justice goes on the bench, he may remain on the bench during good behavior. He may retire at full salary and receive his full salary for the remainder of his life.

Members of Congress contribute 7.5 percent of their salary toward their retirement, which is more than many members of other branches of the Government do. Our retirement is built up gradually over a long period of years, to make it significant.

A member of the Supreme Court can get this same benefit for his widow for 3½ percent if he wishes to do so, but in order to get his own retirement, he does not have to put up 1 cent and he retires at full salary.

There are other factors involved.

One Senator, and he is in the Chamber at the present moment, recently wrote a book in which he called this body the sapless branch.

Madam President, I do not regard myself as a sapless person, and I do not intend to associate myself with any actions which would indicate that I was.

The individual members of the Supreme Court do not bear any responsibility such as that which is borne by a Senator. There is no greater integrity required in the Supreme Court than is required in the Senate—even though some Senators seem to love the picture of flagellating themselves before the public week after week and month after month. I shall not do so. I will not hold with anyone who does.

There is another aspect of this issue, and that is the amount of work that is actually done.

The Supreme Court has not been out of session for 2 or 3 weeks I believe it is—perhaps it is 4 weeks. They return in October. If the Senate is able to conclude its work this summer, some time in August, each Member of the Senate knows what he will do. He will go home and he will work even harder during those 3 or 4 months—if that is possible—than he has worked so far this year. If a Senator is fortunate enough, he may be able to squeeze a couple of weeks' vacation out of it. That is about all he will get.

So, based on the amount of work required, based upon the degree of integrity required, and based upon the ability required, there is no basis for any differentiation in salary between the Supreme Court and Members of Congress. Let us make that plain.

I do not believe that it requires a greater degree of ability to sit on the bench, a greater degree of integrity, on a greater amount of work, than it takes to be a Member of the Senate—if a Member of the Senate is doing his work.

I am very much disappointed that the chairman of the committee did not sit down hard and say, "We will not recede on this point," because we had a vote in the Senate. I believe that the chairman realized, as everyone else does, that if those figures had been set lower, out of an attitude of spite, they would have stuck in the Senate that evening.

Madam President, I am sure no point will be particularly served in my trying to do anything against the conference report other than what I have done; but I invite the attention of the Senate once more to the factors which precipitated the offering of my original amendment.

I believe that the importance and wisdom of these factors are present in the Chamber today, just as much as they were the night the Senate voted on my amendment.

I hope that the Senate is through with its self-flagellation. I hope, for once, that it will again stand up—as it did by its vote that night—and say to the whole world, "We believe the Senate to be a coequal body, not only with the executive branch, but also with the Supreme Court, which sits across the street from us."

It is no valid argument to say, "They have always received more money than we have."

It is never too late to correct inequities or injustices.

It would be my hope that when Senators come up to this issue again, they will somehow be able—either in this way or in another way—to show the other coequal branches of the Government that the Senate is in fact an equal branch of the Government, that we regard ourselves as equal, that we believe in our own integrity, that we believe in our own abilities, and that we yield nothing in these respects to the other branches of the Government.

So, Madam President, on this particular matter, I shall vote against the conference report, regardless of what other Senators may do, because it is the only way I can express my feelings about the concession which has been made on this pay raise bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I deeply regret that the efforts made by the committee to bring this bill to the floor of the Senate today are not satisfactory to my very dear friend, the Senator from Colorado, whom I regard with great affection.

In my opinion, the committee did the best it could in a matter on which it knew there was strong feeling on the part of the Senate.

The chairman of the Senate committee voted enthusiastically, I might say, for the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. We endeavored to maintain the Senator's position. The Senator is well aware, however, that these things are always a matter of give and take. It is necessary to compromise.

If the Senator would look at the figures, they are not quite as he quoted them.

The bill came to the Senate reported by the Senate committee at $43,000, not $43,500 as the Senator from Colorado has stated.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Is not the figure $43,500 for the Chief Justice?

Mr. MONRONEY. Forty-three thousand dollars.

Mr. ALLOTT. For the Chief Justice.

Mr. MONRONEY. Forty-two thousand five hundred dollars for the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court according to the figures we have from the committee. This was compromised by a reduction, let me say to the Senator from Colorado, of $3,000 below the House figure. It came up to a figure of $40,000. The existing salary is $35,500. This was a reduction of $3,000 from the House figure and reduced the increase to a far smaller amount than that given to almost any part of the legislative or executive branches of Government.

Four thousand five hundred dollars for the justices of the Supreme Court, and a similar figure of $4,500 for the Chief Justice.

If the figure had been cut much lower, we would run into a compression within the salary scale where we would be paying judges of the circuit courts, judges of the Court of Claims, judges of the court of appeals, and judges of the Court of Military Appeals, $33,000. This would have approached too narrow a range for judges sitting on the highest court in the land.

Certainly, I am sure the Senator from Colorado knows that the Supreme Court's degree of popularity is never the same; that it always goes up and down.

We are not legislating in this pay raise bill because we approve of the decisions of the Supreme Court currently under discussion. Let me say that I do not agree with many things the Supreme Court does, and I am sure the Senator from Colorado feels the same way.

But we are dealing with the highest court in the land. We are dealing with the highest Court in the greatest Nation in the world, on the judgment of nine men upon whom depends the final interpretation of our Constitution.

I disagreed with President Roosevelt in his Court-packing plan. I would disagree with a plan which arbitrarily reduced the salaries of the Supreme Court—and I know of course that this is not the intention of the Senator from Colorado—because their decisions were not necessarily satisfactory to me, or to him. I would not do that. Neither would the Senator from Colorado.

Certainly, many people across the Nation have the feeling that this is the reason their salaries were cut, because the raise in salary to Supreme Court Justices was so much less than that given to all other members of the executive branch, and to all other Members of Congress.

Even now, let me say that while Senators and Members of the House of Representatives are going to enjoy a $7,500 increase, the members of the Court will be enjoying only a $4,500 increase. So that the ratio between the two salaries, which has been historically different, is narrowing.

Certainly I feel that we did the best we could. The matter is always open to compromise. It has been for a long period of time. I feel that the pay bill should pass. I feel that it represents the very best possible effort to reach a solution in which the House could concur and which the Members of the Senate, after not being able to prevail with the rate fixed by the Senate, felt would be acceptable to the Senate and to the House of Representatives.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, at the very beginning I subscribe to the words spoken by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

In my public service, I have been a judge, a mayor, a Governor, and Senator. The simplest job that I had was that of a judge. I did not have to worry about bringing witnesses to court. I did not have to worry about searching the law. I knew that the lawyers would bring the evidence. I knew that they would bring the witnesses. I knew that they would supply me with briefs on the questions of law that were involved in the case before me. All that I had to possess was the pretense of intelligence.

In my assignments as mayor, Governor, and Senator, I have been burdened with labor and worry far in excess of anything that I ever experienced as a judge. In the capacity which I now occupy, I have to make decisions that deal with the economy of every family in the Nation. I have to make decisions that deal with the security of the country.

I am now subject to libel and slander. When I was a judge, all that I said came from the cathedral on high. No one challenged me. As a judge in my State, I had to contribute a part of my salary to a retirement fund. As a Senator, I have to contribute 7.5 percent of my salary to a retirement fund. The Federal judges do not have to contribute a single cent to the retirement fund. They can go on the inactive list, I believe, at the end of 10 years of service at the age of 60, and 15 years of service at the age of 55. They contribute not a single penny to the fund. For the rest of their lives, if they go on the inactive service list under the present law, the district court judges receive $22,500 a year. The circuit court judges, I believe, receive $30,000 a year. I do not know what the Supreme Court judges receive, but it is in excess of what is received by a district or circuit court judge.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has stated that the position of the Senate with respect to heaviness of responsibility is equal to that of the courts. I say that it exceeds it by far. Those judges do not have to run. They do not have to spend money to keep their positions in an election. They have a lifetime position.

Based upon my experience as a judge, with full recognition of the dignity of the position, I say that we have debased the significance of the position of a legislator and the significance of the position of an executive officer in favor of men who in the main have nothing but a facade. There are other Members of this body who became judges. I make the confession that I never realized how my intelligence grew from the day that I was a lawyer to the next day when I was a judge. The moment I was called judge, I became a man who was infallible. But I was the same FRANK LAUSCHE, beset with the same weaknesses. So much for the judges and no more.

I believe that one of the travesties and one of of the reasons for Congress today wanting to pass a special interest equalization law to fortify the weaknesses of our gold reserves and our balance of payments is the inordinate expenditure of public moneys.

I am now asked to vote for the bill. I opposed it when it came before the Senate several weeks ago. I did not feel that the Senators should be entitled to an increase of $10,000 from 1955, or an increase in salary of from $12,500 to $22,500 a year. Now another increase is proposed, an increase of $7,500, a raise in salary from $22,500 to $30,000 a year.

When I voted against this increase of pay for myself, I made the statement, "How will I ever be able to deny any inordinate petitions for grants of taxpayers' money?" When I made that statement, I believed it. I wanted to keep myself in the position where I could say to petitioners, "I will not give to you that which I would not give to myself." I hold in my hand a letter which came from Zanesville, Ohio. I shall not identify the writer of the letter, because I do not have his consent to do so. He has written urging that I support a measure which would give to every World War I veteran a pension of $100 a month. If I should follow his advice, as a World War I veteran I would be given $100 a month. I am not entitled to it. I do not need it. But the bill which is pending before the Congress provides that every veteran of that war shall receive $100 a month. The citizen in Zanesville, Ohio, to whom I referred, has written:

> We ask you, Mr. Senator, do you really think this is fair and just for the forgotten soldier of 1917?

I was one of them.

Yes, the man enlisted in 1917 and received the $1 per day to fight and, if necessary, to die for the cause that he thought right. I cannot help chuckling,

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

because I remember with what avidity I went to the cashier's window to get my 30 brandnew dollars.

The writer said:

I ask you, Mr. Senator, can you face the forgotten soldier, who is asking for a pension of $100 per month for the twilight years of his life, which are not too many, as many are 68 to 75 years old, while you are asking for an increase of $7,500 a year to make $30,000 a year for you to stay in Washington, D.C.?

That citizen from Zanesville did not know that I had voted against the measure. But his argument is sound. The justice of his claim cannot be denied when he writes, in effect, "If you give yourself a 140-percent increase between 1955 and 1964, how can you deny me as a veteran a pension of $100 a month?"

I can answer the letter. I shall do so gently. The writer obviously does not know that I voted against the bill. He obviously does not know that I said I would not take this increase in salary because I did not believe I was entitled to it. That was my position on the night that the bill was passed, and that is my position today.

I wish to deal with another phase of the question. The administration is asking us today to pass an interest equalization tax bill so that the American dollar will not flow out of the United States into foreign countries. In effect, the bill states, "We are in distress. Our gold reserves are practically gone. If our short-term foreign creditors make demand for payment of our debts in gold, we cannot meet the obligation."

I can understand why that plea is being made. What is sought to be done is probably better than nothing. I would not be telling the truth unless I said that the remedy which is before us is the weak and the easy way out. No political danger of any kind whatsoever is involved. There are means of putting ourselves into a position in which the gold reserve problem would be remedied. It might require a bit of courage. We might be required to ask the public to indulge in a bit of economic austerity. But those requests of self-denial would be far less in weight and sacrifice than what might come within the next half decade unless we do something about it.

What can we do about it? We could balance the budget, but hardly anyone fights to balance the budget.

We are building into our governmental expenditures operations that will be with us until the sun dies. We are doing everything we can to give opiates to the economy. We are "beefing it up" through the following program:

First. We are reducing taxes because it will stimulate the national product.

Second. We have granted credits for capital investments because that will induce capital to invest.

Third. We have liberalized the depreciation laws, which will stimulate the economy.

Fourth. We have started to develop a public works program of the character of 1933, in the form of supplemental public works.

Fifth. We have been asked to adopt a program for the relief of people in the hills of Appalachia. That request has already brought about a request from Arkansas that we provide a similarly basic principle of aid for Arkansas and one for Minnesota. We have been asked to adopt a program to fight "poverty." That is a most appealing term, and one that is hard to argue against.

We have been asked to maintain low interest rates, subsidize local governmental mass transportation systems, expand area redevelopment and the community facilities program.

The measure before the Senate deals with the budget. It deals with placing ourselves in a competitive position with the manufacturers and the vendors of the world who are competing with us.

The President recommended that salary increases be limited to the increased productivity of labor. He asked labor leaders not to demand increased wages that would be in excess of the productivity of the workers. That formula provided that the wage increase ought not to be in excess of increased productivity, and in no event, in excess of 3.2 percent of the worker's salary.

Those were beautiful words. The Nation applauded them. But what has been the execution of those words? We have granted salaries far in excess of what the President's recommendation was. Labor leaders everywhere are demanding wages in excess of what productivity justifies. While all this is happening, our position in world markets and the world economy is growing worse. It will continue to grow worse because we are weakening our position to sell competitively goods in the world markets.

I cannot approve of this measure because it is wrong.

When the bill was originally passed, I, on this Senate floor, publicly announced that I would not accept the increase. I wrote a letter to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue asking him whether I will have to pay a tax on the $30,000 salary even though I will want only $22,500. I am awaiting his reply.

In conclusion, President Kennedy, the man who gave his life for our country said, "Do not ask what your country can do for you, but, rather, ask what you can do for your country."

The Congress of the United States, which is made up of 435 Members, says to the country, "Give each Member as much as he can get. Let him have what the traffic will bear."

How can a Member of Congress say to the soldier from Zanesville, "I will not vote for an increase for you, even though I believe you are entitled to it," when he is, extravagantly, sumptuously, and inconsiderately draining the Treasury and asking for himself everything that the country can give and thinking nothing of what he can give to his country?

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The distinguished Senator is speaking his conscience, reflecting perhaps an attitude with respect to the Senate as a whole. In my nearly 4 years as a Member of the Senate it has been my personal observation that the extravagant and deficit spending to which this body has contributed has not been due to the votes of the Senator from Ohio. If anyone were entitled to a salary increase because of his vigilance in trying to keep trust with the people and the people's hard-earned money, I am sure the Senator from Ohio would be included in that group of Senators, which, unfortunately, is in the minority.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate very much what the Senator from Iowa has said.

In my experience as mayor and Governor, I learned that those who are in the administration of government will guide themselves by the conduct of the mayor or the conduct of the Governor. If the Governor is crooked, if the mayor is crooked, all under them will become crooked. That crookedness cannot be stopped from percolating down into the lowest ranks.

With respect to the U.S. Congress, if it is extravangant, if it has no regard for balanced budgets and policies of fiscal and monetary soundness, the philosophy trickles down through the entire citizenship, leading to destruction.

Mr. MILLER. The same thing may be said also with respect to the Chief Executive of the country.

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, there are many problems in trying to write a pay bill that affects the three branches of the Federal Government and all those associated with it. As a member of the committee of conference that signed the conference report, I feel that we have brought to the Senate a very excellent report, considering the great magnitude of these problems.

I give one warning, and that is that when we pass the bill the cost of running the Post Office Department will be increased by several hundred million dollars. A deficit will probably begin to assume larger proportions. I think it will be incumbent on this Congress, as we begin to approach 1970, with 90 billion pieces of mail, and 1980, with probably 125 billion pieces of mail, to begin a study of modernization of the great postal system of ours, or it will be incumbent upon Congress to handle problems that will cause real difficulties.

The present bill adds approximately $229 million to the postal deficit. The Postmaster General presently estimates the deficit to be $77 million. Thus the total deficit will exceed $300 million. When the deficit rises to this degree, considerations obviously turn to rate increases to make up the difference.

When the pay-rate bill was passed in 1962, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate made this statement in the report which accompanied the bill, H.R. 7927:

The committee unanimously agrees that, before another adjustment in postal rates takes place, the Congress should develop, through its appropriate committees, more exact data on mail classification, postal costs, and processes having to do with greater use of machines and mail handling.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

The need for a refined cost ascertainment system is well recognized. Even the Post Office Department admits that its present cost ascertainment system has many deficiencies. Such a study of cost ascertainment should take place at the earliest possible time in the 89th Congress.

On the subject of mechanization and modernization, a comparable study should take place. In response to a question regarding the major mechanization program, information was recently furnished by the Post Office Department to the Senate Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations which indicated that over an 8-year period, from 1957 to 1964, $125,098,000 had been appropriated for major mechanization but only $87,669,000 had been spent for that program. The difference of $37½ million was spent by the Post Office Department for purposes other than that for which it was appropriated by the Congress. Thus, apparently, this is a program which does not lack funds so much as it lacks direction and planning.

The type of study envisioned in the report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in 1962 is essential to provide that degree of direction and planning necessary to place the Post Office Department in a position to efficiently handle a mail volume grown to staggering proportions.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an excerpt from the cost ascertainment report, 1963, an excerpt from a survey of postal rates, 1964, and certain information from the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill for 1965.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM COST ASCERTAINMENT REPORT 1963

The system, a statistical-accounting process, does not take into account factors, other than cost, which are generally to be considered in adjustment of postal rates and fees under the policies established by law in title 39, United States Code, section 2301–06, as amended. For example, the system does not attempt to evaluate such service differences as (1) the value of priority or deferment given to any one class of mail or service, (2) relative values of the various services to the public, and (3) the relative intrinsic values of the items handled. Such factors are not properly within the scope of a cost accounting system.

EXCERPT FROM SURVEY OF POSTAL RATES 1964

The Department's time-tested cost ascertainment system apportions to each class of mail a fair share of operating costs based on sample observations of actual use of manpower, transportation space, facilities, and equipment. In addition, each mail service is assigned a pro rata share of overhead costs, roughly in proportion to the more direct costs that the services engender. Thus, these cost allocations reflect measurements based on physical characteristics such as weight, size, length of haul, or number of sortings. But the system does not purport to measure the intangibles which make first class, for example, a far more valuable service than third class.

Major mechanization

[In thousands]

Fiscal year	Program [1]	Obligations
1964	$12,658	[2] $11,134
1963	[3] 4,500	224
1962	[4] 10,000	5,354
1961	38,147	10,567
1960	25,536	32,583
1959	20,415	18,796
1958	12,589	7,603
1957	1,253	1,408
Total	125,098	87,669

[1] Program is the amount allocated to the activity at the time the appropriation act is passed. It may be a different amount from that originally requested in the estimate to the Congress, because the appropriation is less than the amount requested or because of changed demands of the various programs. It is the amount shown in the middle column of tables in the following year's budget submission.

[2] Estimated.

[3] The original request to Congress was $27,000, which was reprogramed as follows:

		Thousands
Original request		$27,000
Less:		
Reduction in total appropriation by Congress from total request	$2,000	
Transfers to other appropriations to cover pay increases	17,373	
Other appropriation transfers	3,127	22,500
Revised program		4,500

[4] The original request to Congress was $34,753, which was reprogramed as follows:

		Thousands
Original request		$34,753
Less:		
Reduction in total appropriation by Congress from total request	$12,000	
Transfers to other appropriations	5,000	
Reprogramed to—		
Federal buildings improvement	7,121	
Vehicles and other equipment	632	24,753
Revised program		10,000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I will not ask for a yea-and-nay vote. I have made my position clear on this matter. The Senate spoke on it several weeks ago. I know my words will not change what has been done.

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I want the RECORD to show that I am against the adoption of the conference report on the pay-increase bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote "No" on the question of agreeing to the conference report on the pay-raise bill. I voted "Nay" on the rollcall vote on the bill when it was passed by the Senate; and my reasoning remains the same: It is that I cannot justify voting for this bill—which eventually will cost nearly $1 billion a year—at a time when over 4 million people have no jobs at all, and their families have no regular income, and when our budget has been unbalanced for 4 straight years, and will show a large deficit this year and next. I support the position so ably stated by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PROJECTS APPROVED BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McNAMARA. Madam President, in order that the Members of the Senate and the House, particularly the Appropriations Committees, and other interested parties, may be advised of projects approved by the Committee on Public Works, under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on this subject.

The first is a revised prospectus for the proposed construction of 87 small public building projects; 74 prospectuses for new buildings and acquisition of land, and 8 for extension and/or conversion of existing buildings; and 41 prospectuses for the repair, improvement, and alterations in existing buildings, approved April 4, 1963.

Approval of these buildings is based on prospectuses submitted to the committee by the Administrator of General Services, in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 249, 86th Congress. The committee also held a public hearing at which representatives of GSA appeared, and discussed the public building program, its operation, and the need for the recommended new buildings and alterations to existing buildings.

In addition, the committee approved 1 project for proposed new construction on May 13, 1963; 2 projects on June 13, 1963; and 2 alteration projects on August 20, 1963.

The second is a list of 35 prospectuses for new buildings; 1 previously approved on April 3, 1963, revised prospectus for change in location; and 28 alteration projects, approved April 30, 1963.

The third list is 3 revised prospectuses for proposed construction; 1 alteration project; and 25 prospectuses for construction of small public buildings for use primarily by the Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1964.

The small watershed protection projects were approved under the provisions of Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

lands, managed for multiple use. Our economy and our population will continue to grow and our standard of living will continue to climb. All of our resources, therefore, are going to feel the pressure of increasing public demand, our forest resources included.

Your forest lands can play a multiple role in this future growth. We see here today one evidence of that role. The timber harvests from the forests of northern Maine will be the raw material for this mill—as they are for your existing mills and will be for the new mills now building elsewhere in the State. This harvest provides jobs, payrolls, taxes, a vast bounty to your people. Almost 350 individual manufacturing enterprises in your State are forest based.

But these well-managed industrial forests serve other public purposes as well. They are vast watersheds, collecting and storing rain and melting snow, protecting the soil from erosion and holding untold quantities of water for release in the springs that feed your rivers and lakes or in underground streams that can be tapped by man. Water is a precious resource.

Another role of the managed forest is in providing shelter and food for wildlife. I hope the day never comes when we are too concerned with the material things of life to lose our wonder and concern for the marvelous variety of animals, birds, and water life that populate our forested areas. Many of these species find their most compatible habitat in forests managed for successive harvests of timber, where food and shelter are plentiful—forests protected from the great destroyer, fire.

Finally, and of increasing importance these days, are the recreational opportunities offered by the forests, the wooded mountains, the lakes and rivers of your State. Again, these opportunities are many and varied. Hunting and fishing are a big business for you. Hundreds of boys and girls are at this moment enjoying the matchless experience of camping in your woodlands and on the shores of your lakes. All of our company lands in your State are open to the public except, of course, when fire conditions or logging operations would present undue hazards.

In recent years, there has been pressure for the withdrawal from private ownership of very substantial areas in northern Maine along the Allagash Waterway. These lands would be federalized as some kind of national riverway. This proposal as stated would not only remove these acres from economic use but would effectively block off access to more than a million additional acres of productive forest land.

International Paper Co. has opposed this suggestion. A federalized Allagash would limit the growth of your forest-based industries. In this State, where the forest economy forms such an important segment, it would have a drastic effect on your future economic growth.

We feel that the people of Maine have approached this matter in a logical, reasonable fashion. The appointment of an Allagash River Authority by the 1963 State legislature, to study and report on what should be done with the scenic Allagash area, is a sound approach to this question. Late in June the authority issued a preliminary report. They agree that the preservation of the unique character of the area is of primary importance. The industrial and private owners in the area clearly adhere to this view. After more than 100 years of continuous timber production, the Allagash Waterway still provides one of the Nation's unique, unspoiled wilderness areas. This attests to the public-spirited policies under which these lands have been managed.

It is in our interest and yours that this waterway be maintained in the present wild, free-flowing state.

The authority is preparing its specific recommendations for your next legislature. Protective strips will likely be established along the waterway, either by purchase, gift, easement or zoning.

Governor Reed, on this occasion I want to assure you again that International Paper is prepared to cooperate fully with the Allagash River Authority in their objective of preserving this unique scenic and recreational area. We want people of your State and others to continue to enjoy the hunting and fishing to be found there. We want youngsters to enjoy the white-water canoeing in Chase Rapids, as they do every summer. Whatever method your authority recommends to implement its plans, we will continue, as we have for years, to leave protective borders of timber along the waterway. Our logging roads will be open for public travel. Through our policies of multiple use we will continue the partnership between outdoorsmen and timbermen that has characterized this State for years.

You have our pledge of cooperation, Governor Reed. We mean it.

Now, let me say again how very much we appreciate being able to greet so many of our friends and neighbors on this occasion. This is an auspicious start for the Androscoggin mill.

We are particularly pleased to be able to welcome Governor and Mrs. Reed, the members of Governor Reed's staff and so many of your leading State and local elected and appointed officials. You are going to be proud of what we are building here—and we are too.

And now it is my privilege to introduce our honored speaker today. Governor Reed is a man who has made his mark in your State ever since his graduation from the University of Maine in 1942. After returning from distinguished service with the U.S. Naval Reserve during the war, he joined Walter M. Reed & Sons of Fort Fairfield, one of the State's leading growers and shippers of potatoes. As the years went on he became increasingly active in public affairs, first in the legislature in 1955, then in the State senate from 1957 to 1959, with a term as president of the senate. In 1959 he succeeded to the high office of Governor—an office to which he was reelected in 1960 and again in 1962. His influence has been felt not only within Maine but throughout New England and increasingly at the national level, particularly in his work with the national Governors' conference.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to present to you the Honorable John H. Reed, Governor of Maine.

STATEMENT MADE BY INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO.

JAY, MAINE, August 2, 1964.—International Paper Co. today pledged full cooperation to the Allagash River Authority in its objective of preserving the Allagash area of northern Maine.

The pledge was made by Lamar M. Fearing, president of International Paper to Gov. John H. Reed, as part of formal dedication ceremonies at the site of the company's new $54 million Androscoggin pulp and paper mill in Jay, Maine.

More than 3,500 attended the ceremonies including Representative CLIFFORD MCINTIRE and Representative STANLEY TUPPER. In addition to formal remarks by both Mr. Fearing and Governor Reed, the program included guided tours of the construction area and numerous exhibits about the industry.

Governor Reed hailed the new project, crediting it with starting, "an economic chain reaction, the importance of which will be felt in Maine for generations to come."

"This is truly a great day," the Governor said, "a day of tremendous importance to International Paper and its directors and also it is a great day in the economic life of a State which has, for many generations, properly regarded the pulp and paper industry as its most important single industrial enterprise."

In his remarks, Mr. Fearing noted that the new mill will be the most modern, forward-looking mill in the country when it starts in late 1965. He credited its location in Maine to the wonderful cooperation extended to the company.

"There was no question in our minds," Mr. Fearing said, "that the State of Maine offered a business climate that welcomes new ventures—new industrial undertakings. Our decision to come here was heavily influenced by this and the mutual respect which we have enjoyed for so long."

Mr. Fearing said that the new two-paper-machine mill will be built around a gigantic continuous digester—the newest development in the pulp and paper industry. Towering over 210 feet in the air, the digester will be able to manufacture 500 tons of high quality kraft pulp every day.

"We expect the quality of this pulp to be so outstanding," Mr. Fearing said, "that we plan to shut down the present sulphite pulp operations at our nearby Otis Mill and at our Hudson River Mill in Corinth, N.Y. The entire chemical pulp requirements for both mills, as well as for the two Androscoggin paper machines will be supplied from this one continuous digester."

The Androscoggin Mill will manufacture lightweight bleached paper, primarily lightweight bond, carbonizing, gift wrap, and other similar grades.

Referring to the discussions about the future status of the Allagash, Mr. Fearing said that International Paper opposes pressure for the withdrawal from private ownership of very substantial areas in northern Maine along the Allagash waterway.

"A federalized Allagash would limit the growth of your forest-based industries," he said.

"We feel that the people of Maine have approached this matter in a logical, reasonable fashion. The appointment of an Allagash River Authority by the 1963 legislature, to study and report on what should be done with the scenic Allagash area, is a sound approach to this question."

Addressing himself directly to Governor Reed, Mr. Fearing then said, "I want to assure you again that International Paper is prepared to cooperate fully with the Allagash River Authority in their objective of preserving this unique and scenic recreational area.

"Whatever method your authority recommends to implement its plans," he said, "we will continue as we have for years to leave protective borders of timber along the waterway. Our logging roads will be open for public travel. Through our policies of multiple use, we will continue the partnership between outdoorsmen and timbermen that has characterized this State for many years."

Concluding the formal program, Governor Reed and Mr. Fearing unveiled a large bronze plaque which will later be permanently set at the entrance to the mill.

Attending the ceremonies were many employees and interested people from neighboring towns as well as a large number of State officials, State legislators, town officials, and members of the clergy and professional world.

International Paper officials in addition to Mr. Fearing included: George H. Rand, John L. Tower and Ralph W. Kittle, vice presidents; R. C. Masterman, general manager of the company's northern manufacturing division, and Lawrence J. Kugelman, director of woodlands.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Photo of Maine Band Recalls Fourths of the Nineties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 5, 1964

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Star of July 3, a very interesting article about a distinguished former resident of Maine, Mr. Harold Seiders, 90 years old, who is now living here in Washington.

I know others would like to read this refreshing story of this educator and musician.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, July 3, 1964]

NO PARADE NOW: PHOTO OF MAINE BAND RECALLS FOURTHS OF NINETIES

(By John Sherwood)

The photograph by the window is of a serious group of whiskered young men in gold-braided uniforms posing in front of a Victorian bandstand newly built by one Ulysses Wincapaw.

The time is just before an annual Independence Day celebration in the little town of Union, Maine. The Union Cornet Band paraded all that day, gave an afternoon concert of Sousa marches, and, after the fireworks display that evening on the village common, officially ended things with a quiet "Good Night, Ladies."

That big day in the life of a little town in the 1890's had almost been forgotten by one of the uniformed men who played tenor horn in the band. But the other day the mail brought that photograph from the only other survivor of the band and everything came back again except the music, just in time for the Fourth.

Harold Seiders, 90, will observe the Fourth of July sitting in a chair and looking out the third-floor front window of Mrs. Nelson's Nursing Home at 2021 Kalorama Road NW. There will be no parades within his sight, but the photograph is handy and there are copies of the Portland (Maine) Press Herald and Rockland (Maine) Courier Gazette within reach.

The Union Cornet Band was but a brief interlude in the old man's long life, but it reminds him of swimming and fishing in Seven Tree Pond, and all the other freshwater ponds of his youth—Crawford's Pond, White Oak Pond, Sennebec Pond, and "big Lake Sebago where the water is so clear you can almost drink it."

Mr. Seiders' father had a vegetable farm overlooking Seven Tree Pond, and the view from the bedroom window of the young cornet player was all green and blue at this time of the year. There was an electric excitement in the air when the Fourth approached, and there were many plans to be made and never enough time in which to make them.

ERA HAS PASSED

Now that the era has passed, a simple thing such as an old photograph is worth a great deal to a man in a day when his time is without value. From 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. every day of the week for the last 4 years, Mr. Seiders has known the outside world only through his third-floor window and his Maine newspapers.

What he sees from 2021 Kalorama road is "traffic on Connecticut Avenue. Police cars, fire engines, ambulances, and cars and more cars—one after another, always coming and going some place." And no Seven Tree Pond in sight.

Now pensioned after working with the Portland (Maine) school system for 30 years, Mr. Seiders came to Washington in 1951 to be near his children after his wife died.

A large clock knocks off the seconds with a loud, tiny sound in the bedroom he shares with another elderly man. His left elbow on the windowsill and his right foot propped on a pillow, the old bandsman smokes his pipe and rereads the letters from his few remaining friends in Maine.

MISSES SPRING WATER

He misses the fishing, he'll tell you, and playing with the Union Cornet Band on Independence Day was always the biggest event of the year. But more than anything, he misses "the drinking water up home. I used to fill up on that spring water first thing. It did taste good. Boy, I would love a little taste of that now."

The routes that Saturday's bands will take are fixed by now. But a look into a third-floor window where a kindly old man waits for a parade that will never come again makes one wonder why celebrations couldn't be just a little more flexible.

Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964

SPEECH
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1964

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I might state to our colleagues who have just come into the Chamber that we are in the process of considering a conference report on something that might be of interest to them. It is called the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964. If you will bear with me for just a very few minutes, I think we may be able to write the final chapter on this important legislation.

I have studied the conference report. I feel a little bit like the man who told about his mother-in-law driving his brandnew uninsured Cadillac off a cliff. They asked him how he felt, and he said he had mixed emotions.

I have mixed emotions about the conference report, but I am interested in legislation, not conversation. I urge the House to support the conference report and to see that this bill is enacted into law this week.

There are some changes in the bill that I think are especially good. The important and able members of our congressional and committee staffs are properly taken care of in this bill. I have been asked by many Members, "What is this going to do to the pay of my staff?" I suppose before the day is over many of you will be asked about that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a table in which you can find the present pay of your staff people and go across the columns and find the pay they will receive after this bill is enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

LEGISLATIVE SALARY INCREASES

This is designed to provide percentage salary adjustments for legislative employees comparable to those provided for employees under the Classification Act. The increases are provided in an amount equal to 3½ percent of the employee's gross rate plus 1 percent of his gross rate for each whole multiple, or part of a multiple of $500 basic compensation; or an amount equal to 5 percent of such gross rate, whichever is greater.

Multiple	Base	Present gross	Conference substitute	
			Percent increase	New gross
0	$5	$891	5.0	$935
0.1	60	1,020	5.0	1,071
	500	2,057	5.0	2,160
1	505	2,069	5.5	2,183
2	1,000	3,157	5.5	3,330
2	1,005	3,166	6.5	3,372
2.4	1,200	3,534	6.5	3,764
3	1,500	4,052	6.5	4,316
3	1,505	4,061	7.5	4,366
3.6	1,800	4,655	7.5	5,004
4	2,000	5,088	7.5	5,470
4	2,005	5,099	8.5	5,533
4.8	2,400	5,955	8.5	6,461
5	2,500	6,172	8.5	6,697
5	2,505	6,183	9.5	6,770
6	3,000	7,255	9.5	7,945
6	3,005	7,266	10.5	8,029
7	3,500	8,339	10.5	9,215
7	3,505	8,350	11.5	9,310
7.2	3,600	8,556	11.5	9,540
8	4,000	9,422	11.5	10,506
8	4,005	9,433	12.5	10,613
9	4,500	10,506	12.5	11,819
9	4,505	10,517	13.5	11,937
9.6	4,800	11,136	13.5	12,640
10	5,000	11,550	13.5	13,109
10	5,005	11,560	14.5	13,237
11	5,500	12,528	14.5	14,345
11	5,505	12,538	15.5	14,481
12	6,000	13,469	15.5	15,556
12	6,005	13,478	16.5	15,702
13	6,500	14,409	16.5	16,786
13	6,505	14,418	17.5	16,942
14	7,000	15,349	17.5	18,035
14	7,005	15,359	18.5	18,200
14.4	7,200	15,725	18.5	18,635
15	7,500	16,289	18.5	19,303
15	7,505	16,299	19.5	19,477
16	8,000	17,230	19.5	20,590
16	8,005	17,239	20.5	20,773
17	8,500	18,170	20.5	21,895
17	8,505	18,179	21.5	22,088
17.7	8,880	18,884	21.5	22,945
18	9,000	19,110	21.5	23,219
18	9,005	19,120	22.5	23,422
18.9	9,475	20,000	22.5	24,500

Another improvement in the bill is the increased raises for middle grades of GS–9, GS–10, and GS–11, the people who were almost overlooked in the House bill.

I have heard since yesterday a number of rumors about this bill. I have heard some objections to the conference report. The rumors I have heard are unfounded. I think we ought to straighten these things out so the people understand what the bill does and does not do.

I have been told all Federal judges will receive larger raises than the Members of Congress and that the old relationship have been distorted.

Under the conference report, all the Federal judges get exactly what they get in the House bill except the Supreme Court Judges get $2,500 less than in the House bill. So that instead of the judges being raised by the conference report, one set of judges is lowered and the other Federal judges remain the same as in the House bill.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

I was asked by someone if it were not true that sub-Cabinet people are being paid by the conference bill more than Members of Congress. This is also not true.

Cabinet members were raised $2,500 from the House bill.

The level II executives remain the same as in the House bill and the other three levels of executive pay were cut in conference rather than being increased.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Naturally, being chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am interested in the salary of the Judges. Do I understand the gentleman to say that Judges of the Supreme Court have their salaries reduced by $2,500? If that is the case, may we know the reason why there has been such a reduction?

Mr. UDALL. I will say to the chairman of the great Committee on the Judiciary that there is no reduction of the Supreme Court Judges' salaries. The Supreme Court Judges are actually getting an increase of $5,000. There is a $2,500 reduction from the figure in the House bill.

Mr. CELLER. In substance what will Supreme Court Judges get now after the bill is passed and what was their salary before the bill is passed?

Mr. UDALL. They are getting at the present time $35,000 with an additional amount for the Chief Justice. If this bill is passed, they will get $40,000. So they are getting a very substantial raise.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. In other words, the point is that the increase has been reduced?

Mr. UDALL. Precisely, I thank the gentleman.

Just a couple of more observations and then I shall conclude.

I think the Senate made a great mistake and I regret very much that the House saw fit to delete the amendment that we adopted which had such broad support from my good friends on the left and from my good friends on the right. We are almost back now in congressional, judicial and executive salaries to where the commission in President Eisenhower's term said that we should have been in 1954 and 1955. We cut and whittled the increases for the executive, for judges and for Members of Congress down and we had adopted in the House a far-reaching proposal which would have moved the salaries along in the future through the operation of automatic and fair machinery. The Senate did not pass this provision. It was deleted in conference. I think it is a very great mistake. I think it is machinery that is needed.

Just, for example, 10 years ago the Randall commission recommended that the salaries of Members of Congress and the executives in similar positions be about $27,000. In 1955 this was compromised badly, and now we have cut this down and down in compromises in this bill to where we end up today barely above the level we were told by the bipartisan commission we should have been 10 years ago.

I think it is a serious mistake but, as I say, I am interested in legislation. We are late in the session, and therefore I am going to urge the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman enlighten us as to whether the members of the parole board will have their salaries increased by the passage of this bill?

Mr. UDALL. I am advised by the staff that their salary is increased; yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned the Randall report of some time ago. There was a pay bill passed in 1962. The Randall report said, or RANDALL himself said, that this pay bill or rather the increase in pay would be taken care of through greater productivity.

I have seen a lot of appropriation bills go through the mill since that time, and if any of this pay increase was taken care of through Mr. RANDALL'S increased productivity on the part of employees I have failed to find it, because every appropriation bill has carried money for increases as a result of the 1962 act.

Mr. UDALL. I sharply disagree with the gentleman. Ten percent of the cost of this bill will be absorbed by the agencies, under a mandatory provision. We have heard dramatic testimony in our committee about efficiency and about savings in personnel. I do not attribute it all to a direct increase of, say, 5 percent in salary or anything of that kind, but there have been remarkable productivity increases in the Federal Government.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Of course, the statement by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] did not involve the absorption of cost through attrition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes additional to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] said that the increased efficiency would be such that there would be no additional out-of-pocket expense to the taxpayers.

Mr. UDALL. Let me conclude with two observations.

I believe the House of Representatives can be proud. We did the work on this bill. We started it. The House had the courage to do this in an election year. It has never been done before, that I know of, in an election year.

We did this because it was a good bill and because it was good for efficiency of the Federal Government and because it had to be done.

This is the first time that Congress has taken the whole Federal salary system and, in one bill, attempted to make an orderly, rational, interrelated structure. If we pass this legislation this week we can be proud.

Let me call attention to one more thing. President Johnson, the leader for those of us over here, has fought for this bill. He helped us to resurrect it after it was defeated.

I should like to say something my friends on the other side of the aisle may not have noted. Recently your chosen leader, and presidential nominee, one of my friends from Arizona voted for this bill. We from Arizona try to vote the way we see things—and when this bill came before the Senate about 3 weeks ago he supported it. He is a man who has been in business and knows one cannot get top executives on shoe clerk salaries.

I say to my friends over here, "Follow your leader." We will follow our leader. We will both be going in the same direction.

Let us pass this bill.

The Supreme Court's Unwise Decisions on Apportionment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 5, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the most recent decisions of the Supreme Court regarding apportionment of State legislative bodies have rocked this country. These decisions illustrate just how far the Court has strayed from any reasonable construction of its own rightful place among our political institutions. The recent and multiplying scourge of judgemade law which has set about to recklessly and antidemocratically reform a nation in the Court's image must be checked at once.

The improper decisions of the Court in the apportionment cases demand, for the sake of our whole system of government, reversal. To accomplish this purpose, I have introduced legislation which would start the machinery for a constitutional amendment. The amendment would have the effect of overruling the Court's unwise decisions on apportionment and reestablishing some of the battered States rights in this area.

At this time, under unanimous consent, I would like to include in the RECORD, a copy of the statement which I submitted to the House Judiciary Committee in support of House Joint Resolution 1087:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE McLOSKEY

Mr. Chairman, the foundations of liberty are once again under attack by the Supreme Court. In the most recent decisions by that branch it has been declared that State legislative bodies, representing the people of the States, are no longer able to determine their

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

own apportionment systems. In these decisions a giant stride away from the system of guarded liberties, which the Constitution established, has been made. House Joint Resolution 1087, which would restore some of those liberties the Court has threatened, is the subject of my presentation here today.

House Joint Resolution 1087 would call into operation the amending process of the Constitution in order to provide that a State legislature would have the constitutional prerogative of apportioning one house of its State assembly on some basis other than population. The amending process has not been referred to very frequently with success in the history of this country—a dozen times in the past century and a half. An amendment to the Constitution is a grave action to be relied upon only with the utmost care and after arduous consideration. It is after such care and consideration that I have introduced House Joint Resolution 1087.

The necessity of this proposal has been demanded by certain decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court which wantonly fly in the face of history and openly ignore the explicit statements of the U.S. Constitution. The Court, over the cogent and articulate warnings of Justices Harlan, Clark, and Stewart, has vindicated a special theory of political representation as the only one acceptable under the 14th amendment's equal protection clause. By newly established Court constructed precedents, by typically fuzzy Supreme Court logic, by completely ignoring the history of our country, and by openly ignoring the clear words of the Constitution, the Court has removed from the people the sovereign power to establish their own State representative assemblies on grounds which are not explicitly prohibited by the Federal Constitution. The recent rash of political decisions handed down by the Supreme Court are clearly based on the personal political prejudices of the Justices masquerading under such theories of judicial review as "activism" and "developing constitutionalism." The ways in which these pernicious theories of judicial review endanger our system of government are many.

First, the Court has done immediate wrong to the States affected by their decision. By robbing the States of their sovereign power to apportion their own legislatures by political process, the Supreme Court has taken one of the most fundamental of legislative prerogatives; and by so doing, has effectively reduced State government to a hollow facade. The Federal judiciary has taken to itself the power to pass on the acceptability of State apportionment, and could presumably dictate the political climate of a State by gerrymandering from the bench. In wronging the States by disallowing theories of representative government acceptable for centuries, the Court has also wronged the people of the affected States by denying them the right to decide their own criteria for legislative apportionment. And clearly, the Constitution does not deny the people these rights. As Justice Harlan pointed out in his dissent in *Reynolds* v. *Sims*, the only section of the Constitution dealing directly with State legislative apportionment recognizes and accepts the possibility of imposed inequities in the right to vote. Paragraph 2 of the 14th amendment which the majority of the Court flatly ignored spells out the remedy—and it is an optional remedy—for a reduction by a State in the size of its qualified electorate. The 15th amendment prohibits a State from denying a citizen the right to vote merely because of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." The 19th amendment adds to the list of reasons why the right to vote may not be abridged, a person's sex. The 24th amendment would add to the list, the payment of a special tax. Nowhere in the Constitution is the right to vote guaranteed against abridgment or partial abridgment on the basis of place of residence. The Supreme Court of the United States has no legitimate right to declare that such a prohibition exists when, in fact, it clearly does not. If, when the 14th amendment and the constituent equal protection clause was ratified, geographic factors were supposed to have been eliminated from consideration in legislative apportionment, a statement to that effect surely would have been added to the prohibitions of the contemporary 15th amendment. And if, by oversight, the people of the United States omitted it there, surely they would have included it in the later 19th amendment which also altered suffrage or in the most recent 24th amendment which once again affected the franchise. The undeniable fact of the matter is that the American people have never overwhelmingly held to the "one-man, one-vote" theory of representative government; the fact that the Supreme Court thinks they should have, notwithstanding.

One wrong, then, that the apportionment decisions accomplish is a deprivation of State's rights. The Court, in the abused name of personal rights, has denied the rights of the States and vindicated, above all else, Court's rights—the rights of the courts to make any of their own private prejudices and moral convictions the law of the land. Yet, if in trampling States rights the Court has gone beyond the wildest dreams of judicial activists and beyond any reasoned understanding of the Constitution, the greatest wrong which the Court has inflicted is against the Constitution itself and the free government it established.

The flagrant exercise of what Justice Harlan has dubbed the "amending power" of the Supreme Court threatens, above all else, our separation of powers. Now, in the 20th century, when the need for the division of powers, both horizontal and vertical, is most urgent, the Court is breaking down the walls. Now, when power and authority are easily and rapidly pyramided, when the advances in the study of molding masses into conformity are progressing steadily, an effective system of power diffusion is paramount. We, who are aware of the truism that absolute power corrupts absolutely, cannot sit by and watch the Supreme Court destroy the checks for liberty which our Constitution clearly set down. We must remember, too, that the checks and balances in our system do not always execute themselves, especially when one branch develops a craving lust for control. The relationships of the branches to each other is constantly varying and in danger of reaching a state of imbalance. When such an imbalance is evident, action is the responsibility of the branch whose powers are being usurped. The Court, time and again in the past 10 years, has assumed legislative powers and has ignored State authority, and so the Congress and the States must act.

The Court's action presents a danger to the Constitution in still another way. The recent decisions which use the Constitution as a substitute for a legal code, and which are based on the theory that every supposed ill which befalls the American people has a solution in the Constitution, is a serious danger to the Constitution.

The Constitution does not go to great lengths to demand that Government achieve certain ends thought by judges to constitute justice. What a constitution in fact and in theory does is to establish a government, define its powers and limits, and allow it to determine its own ends and its own definitions of justice. Judicial notions of social and political justice cannot be allowed to stand as the law of the land. If they were, the dynamics of our free society, devoted to republican principles and government by representative elections would inevitably give way to general abdication of responsibility which is so characteristic of government by lawsuit or dictate.

I would also remind my fellow Representatives that capricious usurpation of power, whether in the name of the majority, the minority, the rich, the poor, justice or injustice, is tyranny. Our real liberties are protected by our unique system of checks and balances which sacrifices quick action and expediency for personal freedom. Our system is and must remain more important than isolated and controversial policy reforms, and the Supreme Court is threatening that system.

Last, but not least, among those whom the Court has wronged in the apportionment decisions is the Supreme Court itself. As Justice Frankfurter was always quick to point out, the Court cannot continue to gallop through the political thicket with reckless abandon and expect not to get its robes torn. Because the Court has no mandate from the people, because it has no power to lay or collect taxes, and because it has no armies, it is dependent for its legitimacy and efficacy upon the good will of the people. From newspapers and from my own experience with the public, I can attest that this good will is wearing quite thin. This present Court is in danger of wrecking itself as an effective political institution.

I recognize that an amendment to the U.S. Constitution must be something more than a means of scolding the Court. An amendment to the Constitution must be defensible on the grounds of what, in particular, it seeks to accomplish.

Above all else, the amendment envisioned in House Joint Resolution 1087 would seek merely to reestablish principles of representative government older than the Nation itself. It has long been the practice of Americans to take into account factors other than population in the process of legislative apportionment. As a matter of historical fact, if State legislatures had been apportioned strictly on the basis of population at the time of the ratification of the Constitution, the Constitution might never have been ratified at all. In the late 18th century there were also inequities in State legislative districts, but at the time, they favored the city populations and acted to the detriment of the western farmers in each of the States. The political complexion of what was then the West was antifederalists, if not anarchistic. Had the principle of "one man, one vote" been fully accepted under these circumstances, the Constitution might never have been ratified. A system of representation which produced the Constitution of the United States cannot be all bad.

The statements of Chief Justice Warren that: "Legislators represent people, not trees or acres (;) * * * [L]egislators are elected by voters, not farms or cities or economic interests * * *" is alarming. If there seems to be one truism, above all others in American politics it is that interest groups are an integral part of the political system. From Madison's "Federalist No. 10" to Beard's studies of American history to the work of the Nye committee, the realistic assumption in America has been that interest groups do play an active part in politics. What the Court has done is to turn their backs on the true conditions and merely insure that the control of government shifts from some groups to different groups. And I do not believe it is coincidence that the groups destined to rule by Court fiat are generally more sympathetic to the same causes of reform the Court has been serving.

The function of geographical representation has never been to represent trees or pastures, but it has been to insure a fair system of checks and balances in State governments among very real and differing interests. It is in this respect that the Court has deprived many minority interests of their checks upon the actions of the numerical majority.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

P + A
New Pay Bill

Post
7 Aug 64

The Federal Diary

100,000 Face Loss Of Retroactive Pay Under New Raise

By Jerry Kluttz

A last-minute switch of signals will prevent retroactive pay raises under the Morrison bill for thousands of Federal employes.

Kluttz

Those bypassed are upwards of 100,000 non-classifieds whose salaries are fixed by heads of their agencies. Senate-House conferees scrapped a proposal, sought by the White House and tentatively approved earlier by the conferees, to give agency heads power to make pay raises effective back to the first pay period in July.

Conferees feared the provision would set off a parliamentary hassle on the House floor that would have delayed final congressional approval of the pay raise bill. Legislative experts advised the conferees that the provision would be subject to attack as neither the original House nor Senate bill carried a similar section.

A 1955 ruling by the Comptroller General holds that agency heads have no authority to make salary increases for their employes effective retroactively. The White House sought to overcome this decision in order to give non-classifieds back-pay raises like classifieds, postals and other groups of Federal employes.

Chart showing new pay rates for Post Office employes. *Page C2.*

As matters now stand higher salaries for non-classifieds will be effective at the beginnings of their first pay periods after the bill is signed into law, which could be today.

Many here are among those who face the loss of retroactive pay. They are in the Central Intelligence Agency, National Security Agency, National Aeronautics and Space Agency, Atomic Energy Commission, the Government Printing Office and all jobs under what is known as Public Law 313.

Also, local employes of the **Army's National Guard, Selective Service and Tennessee Valley Authority** will not get back pay as well as a scattering of employes on Capitol Hill and in agencies such as **Agriculture, Interior, Defense,** etc.

Members of Congress are aware of the injustice and the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee hopes to attach the authority as a rider to a non-controversial House-approved bill and get it enacted into law.

Incidentally, FBI employes are under the Classification Act and are not non-classifieds, as I noted here the other day. They are exempt from Civil Service.

Conferees also failed to continue the authority of the **Panama Canal Co.** to fix pay of its executives at rates higher than Grade 18 which is $24,500 in the Morrison bill. Another rider is being drafted to correct this problem.

Many Capitol Hill employes are both confused and unhappy over their pay boosts. Congress has so many different pay systems for its employes that no general rules apply.

Classified employes or those employes whose salaries follow rates in the Classification Act will get increases that average only 4.3 per cent. Those paid through either the House Disbursing Office or the financial office of the Senate will get raises that average 10 per cent. Folding room employes will get a 7 per cent raise.

Higher salaries for employes in the offices of Senators aren't automatic. Each Senator will have 15 days after the bill

See DIARY, C3, Col. 5

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

for suggesting that there is some kind of special virtue about war, that man derives vigor from participation in war, whereas peace has a tendency to corrupt us with ease and somehow destroy the real muscle of a man; and that the only way we can really be men who can walk upright is to participate in combat with our fellow men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD at this time, because I believe the editor does an excellent job of laying that silly case to rest, reminding us again of the importance of what William James called, a good many years ago, the moral equivalent to war. I believe that we are still engaged in a search for the moral equivalent of war and that is, really, in my judgment, the hope and promise of most of the people who make up the Council for a Livable World.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR HAS NO VIRTUES

(By Dwight Wm. Jensen)

There is a man of limited prudence and judgment named Holmes Alexander who writes columns that are printed by the Idaho Daily Statesman.

A few weeks ago he did a piece on the virtues of war. He quotes a one-legged Medal of Honor winner who was headmaster when he went to school and who said war improves the breed. Any war which Holmes Alexander survives cannot be said to have improved the breed.

Alexander refers to "bilious propaganda about the idiocies of war and the cloying virtues of everlasting peace." He speaks of "the brine and bilge of contemporary peacemongering."

He sneers at writers who write about ways to end all war, and he says it is "the nature of man" to make war, and that "it is not to be altered by any power less than our Maker."

A better mind than Holmes Alexander's—and the 1960 census revealed that in Idaho alone there are nearly 700,000 better minds than Holmes Alexander's—Winston Churchill, who has some experience with war, said, "War is little more than a catalog of mistakes and misfortunes."

So war can be eliminated only by our Maker? You recall the cliche "God helps those who help themselves." We remember also the late President Kennedy's words that, "On earth, God's work is ours."

But Holmes Alexander would probably not care to quote Kennedy. The column we question appeared in the Statesman the day after that man's assassination and was a mocking sort of reflection upon Kennedy's search for peace.

Alexander is one of those great patriots who does such things as criticize the Supreme Court for its decision about Bible reading in the public schools. If he had read the Bible, in the public schools or elsewhere, he would have come across some words by the Son of our Maker:

"Blessed are the peacemakers."

Mr. CHURCH. I commend the Senator for the stand he has taken. I know him to be a man of great and good conscience—and of courage.

I close by restating I do not believe that the United States—which budgets 80 percent of its national revenue to programs related to warfare, past, present, or future, which spends more than half its annual operating budget to maintain its Armed Forces, where a vast corporate complex has a vested interest in armaments, where hundreds of societies and veterans' groups constantly side with the military viewpoint—is a country which has much to fear from a small association of scientists, college professors, professional people, and ordinary parents who are alarmed about the fact that we have raised a stockpile of weapons of such nightmarish power, that, if ever detonated, would be the equivalent of exploding a 20-ton bomb against the head of every inhabitant on this planet.

These citizens, the target of attack this afternoon, are merely trying to do what they can to effect a disarmament program, with enforcement controls and mutual inspection procedures, which might, one day, make it possible for the human race to live free from fright, beyond the shadow of a reckoning coming swift and final in the night.

I cannot believe that theirs is a pernicious influence, set upon the destruction of the United States of America. I do not, of course, stand on the floor of the Senate this afternoon to underwrite everyhting that any of these advocates may have said or may propose, because I reserve the right to make my own judgment.

Mr. McGOVERN. I reserve the same right, also.

Mr. CHURCH. I know the Senator from South Dakota does. I believe that the position he takes is a sound and sensible position. I commend him for it. Once again he renders his country a fine service, as he always has before, from the moment he first became a Senator of the United States.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his invaluable contribution.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for yielding to me.

First, I should like to commend him, as well as my dear friend the Senator from Idaho for the fine comments they have made in rebuttal to the quite extraordinary statements made by a number of Senators earlier this afternoon.

I endorse everything that the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Idaho have said. I wish I could have said it as eloquently and as convincingly.

I should like to pay my respects, briefly, to Mr. Holmes Alexander, who I note has been in the gallery while this series of speeches has been made.

I know him of old. His writings are syndicated, for reasons which have always escaped me, in one of our great metropolitan Pennsylvania newspapers.

I shall not deal in innuendo. I should like, rather, to deal in provable facts. As the Senator from South Dakota amply demonstrated from the record a few moments ago, Mr. Alexander is and has been for years a right-wing radical whose political philosophy, if adopted, would clearly take us back to the jungle and remove many, if not all, of the benefits of civilization.

Those are rather strong words, said in part, perhaps, in lighter vein. But, nonetheless, I firmly believe that Mr. Alexander has for years represented a philosophy on education exemplified by the one room, little red schoolhouse which has a rather supreme contempt for intellectualism and for eggheads, which would like to revert, in short, to the happy days of the early 19th century, turning its back on everything that has happened in the world since that date.

I am amazed that any Senator would take seriously these ridiculous and downright silly charges of Mr. Alexander against the Council for a Livable World.

I am proud to have received in the campaign of 1962, when I ran for reelection, rather significant contributions from members of the Council for a Livable World, who were encouraged to make contributions in my behalf by Mr. Leo Szilard, now unhappily dead, but one of the great scientists of the modern world and one of the inventors—as the Senator from South Dakota has said—of the atomic bomb, a man who devoted the declining years of his life, after he knew that he had incurable cancer, to the cause of peace and to the cause of a livable world.

I often wonder why Mr. Alexander, who follows that rightwing line of his, does not attack the real advocates in this country of general and complete disarmament under enforcible world law.

Why does he not attack Christian Herter, who was Secretary of State, and the first American of prominent office to advocate general and complete disarmament under enforcible world law?

Why does he not attack our late beloved President John F. Kennedy, who in three magnificent speeches, two of them in the United Nations, and the third at American University in the District of Columbia, laid it on the line that the foreign policy of our country was to advance the same cause which the Council for a Livable World has been advancing, and for advancing which it has come under attack by Mr. Alexander and his rightwing cohorts.

Why does he not attack John McCloy? Why does he not attack Arthur Dean? Why does he not attack William Foster?

Indeed, why does he not attack President Lyndon Baines Johnson, who advocates the same principles of foreign policy and disarmament which the Council for a Livable World is proud to espouse, to recommend, and to support?

What disturbs me is the attitude in the Senate toward the cause of peace, a just and enduring peace, negotiated from strength. For I believe, to borrow the words of the late President Kennedy, "that we should never negotiate out of fear, but we should never fear to negotiate."

We saw some rather ugly things in the Senate during the debate on the test ban treaty last year. The belligerence in the Senate which was referred to by the Senator from Idaho, is the same spirit of belligerence which was attacked by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

last public address he made while still President of the United States. I do not like to see that spirit of belligerence in the Senate. I do not like to see that archaic and obsolete attitude toward the problems of the modern world. I would hope, perhaps, that some mild change in that climate might be created by the action of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Idaho, who have shown the courage to rise on the floor of the Senate and state their own supreme convictions and their strong support of the policies of three Presidents of the United States—Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson—in support of a just and a livable world.

I thank my friend from South Dakota for yielding to me.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Idaho for their moving, eloquent, and informed statements here today. I was assured of my position before I took the floor this afternoon. But I am more assured of it after listening to the persuasive eloquence of those two Senators who have done so much in the cause of peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I did not hear all of the discussion on the Republican side this afternoon, as I was in and out of the Chamber. But I did hear the names of certain Members on this side mentioned. I am afraid that the implications were such as to make it difficult for them in their personal and political carers.

I am quite sure that was not the intent. I wish to say publicly, as majority leader of the Senate, that insofar as I am concerned, I have no doubt about the patriotism, integrity, and the devotion of men like the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and others. They have performed capably, well, and in the highest traditions of this body since they first became Members of the Senate. So as far as being for unilateral disarmament is concerned, as one Senator seemed to indicate, I do not know of a Senator on either side who is in favor of unilateral disarmament.

The Senator from South Dakota has a distinguished war record as a bomber pilot in World War II. He is the holder of the Distinguished Flying Cross.

The distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] served with distinction in the China-Burma-India area. I do not know of a Democratic or Republican Senator whose integrity, patriotism, or devotion to his country should be impugned in any way, even by implication.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina is willing, I would ask the Chair to make sure that the Chamber is kept fairly clear during this debate. The Senate will be in session until a relatively late hour this evening because of circumstances which are apparent to all.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am proud to report to the Senate the committee's unanimous approval of H.R. 11049, with amendment, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964.

This legislation is a broad and all-inclusive pay adjustment measure which, in my view, will rank among the most important actions of the Congress in recent years to strengthen the Federal Government and increase its efficiency.

I particularly emphasize that the committee's report is a unanimous report. Members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on both sides of the aisle, working harmoniously and with nonpartisan objectives, have together studied and discussed H.R. 11049 title by title, section by section, and, in some cases, line by line. The work of the members of the committee has been diligent, conscientious, and devoted. They have responded to word from the President of the United States that this measure is one of the most important in his legislative program for the 88th Congress, and their response, consisting of hard work in long daily meetings, has been made at a particular time in the history of the Senate when many other important demands were being made upon their time and energies. I congratulate the committee on the spirit in which the members have undertaken to improve H.R. 11049 as passed by the House of Representatives, and as chairman I thank them each individually for their intelligent and effective cooperation with the President and with me.

This bill, as reported, is directed toward accomplishing four purposes which will remedy a number of inequities and will establish pay relationships resulting in greater efficiency in the Federal civilian service and increased economy throughout all Government operations. The purposes of H.R. 11049 are:

First. To reaffirm the commitment of the Congress to the policy of adjusting the civilian career salary systems in accordance with the principle of comparability. This policy, one of the most reasonable and far-reaching determinations ever made by the Congress in the field of Federal pay, was declared in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, which clearly states the sense of the Congress that—

> Federal salary rates shall be comparable with private enterprise salary rates for the same levels of work.

Second. To establish a new, consistent, and rational salary structure for positions of the highest level in the Federal Government.

Third. To provide for the first time a logical relationship between career salaries under the civilian statutory pay systems and the salaries of top positions in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

Fourth. To adopt a salary structure which will respond to the present-day needs of the Federal Government, to the end that recruitment and retention of personnel of the very highest level—from the bottom to the top—can be accomplished.

Perhaps the most widely discussed section of H.R. 11049 is its provision for an increase in the annual salaries of the Members of the Congress from $22,500 to $30,000 a year. Increases in congressional pay constitute a touchy and controversial problem always. Ignoring this problem will not make it go away.

The committee, recognizing the constitutional injunction that the Senate and House must establish the rate of pay for its own Members, has tried to abide by its responsibility. It is our judgment that the compensation of Senator and Congressmen ought to be increased by $7,500 per annum. No one who serves in the Congress can be unaware that our duties and responsibilities have increased substantially since 1955, when congressional pay was raised from $15,000 a year. We are all thoroughly familiar with the costs incurred in maintaining two homes and with the necessity for frequent trips to our home States, where we can listen to the views of those who sent us here. We all know that the days of midsummer adjournment are probably gone forever, and that ours has become more than a full-time job. In my opinion, these facts of life must be squarely faced and reckoned with, not only for the benefit of present incumbents, but also for those who follow us in the Senate and the House.

I say again that the congressional increase endorsed by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee is intended for the office and not for the present Member. It reflects not only the financial realities of running and serving, but also the prestige, dignity, and status of the Congress and its Members. I am confident that when H.R. 11049 comes to a vote, the Senate will face forthrightly its difficult responsibility for establishing equitable pay for its Members.

This action to adjust Federal compensation up and down the line comes none to soon. The Salary Reform Act of 1962 provides that the President shall report annually to the Congress his recommendations—based upon studies conducted by the Bureau of Labor statistics—for any Federal salary adjustments he deems advisable. In accordance with the 1962 act, President Kennedy more than a year ago recommended comparability pay increases similar to those provided for in H.R. 11049; and suggestions for executive, legislative, and judicial pay have been before the Congress since the report last year of the President's advisory panel on Federal salary systems, the Randall report.

The fact that Congress did not act in 1963 to adjust Federal compensation has

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

resulted in many unfortunate inequities and an alarming departure of Federal pay from the comparability pay line. The fact that the recommendations of the Randall report have not been interpreted into Federal legislation until now has resulted, furthermore, in serious difficulty for the President in obtaining and keeping the services of men of high caliber for the top-most executive positions in the Government.

The President has told me on more than one occasion that this is true.

The salary provisions for executive pay have been scaled down from the Randall recommendations, in recognition of the fact that in the upper levels of the Federal service—both career and executive—the Government can never financially reward its top officials in such a way as to compete with private enterprise. In other words, while the committee endorses—and trusts that the Senate will continue to endorse—the principle of comparability in all ranks other than those at the top, we are aware that those who serve their country in positions of high rank in all three branches of the Government must be willing to accept far less than their counterparts in the private economy.

This fact is recognized as part and parcel of our national life. Nevertheless, it is my view that the sacrifice that many of our leaders in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches have been asked to make are too great. The increases provided in this measure will go a long way toward rectifying a situation which all recent Presidents, particularly Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, have deplored and which they have time and again asked the Congress to correct. The report of the President's advisory panel is most pertinent on this subject. The panel makes these points:

It is not uncommon in the history of our country to ask our citizens to give up a high income to accept a lesser one in a responsible Federal office. But the sacrifice ought to be of a kind which many capable men—not just a few—are financially prepared to make. Furthermore, there are many able young men who have had no time to accumulate financial reserves. The country should not be denied the services of these men because of inadequate Federal pay scales. The Nation cannot afford to depend only upon rich men to run its affairs.

One of the most reasonable and beneficial provisions of title III, the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, is the establishment of an orderly series of five levels of executive compensation. Over the years through the various executive pay acts and organic legislation establishing new Federal agencies, some 19 different executive pay levels have sprung up within the Federal service. On occasion, the need for increased compensation has been reflected in the salaries paid the directors of newly created agencies, while similar top officials of older agencies have been overlooked. The prominence of some agencies as opposed to the inconspicuousness of others has also sometimes resulted in unjustifiable executive salary differentials.

This bill for the first time brings together an orderly and rational system of five levels, in which positions of equal rank and responsibility receive equal compensation. This arrangement is the result of intensive study and close cooperation between the committees of the Senate and House on the one hand, and the Bureau of the Budget on the other, and the administrative agencies, also.

As passed by the House, H.R. 11049 established six pay levels of executive compensation. The top three levels—levels 1, 2, and 3—are listed by position. The lower three levels—levels 4, 5, and 6—would be filled under the House bill through placement which the President would be authorized to make in accordance with standards spelled out in the act.

The Senate committee, on the recommendation of the Budget Bureau, has eliminated level VI entirely. This level was composed of a limited number of executives who could be most appropriately placed, it was felt, in level 5 or, for pay purposes, in the top grades of the general schedule. This arrangement also relieved the pay compression which existed between the executive salary schedule and the general schedule when there were six executive levels.

The committee has further amended the House bill to provide for statutory listing of the positions in levels 4 and 5, as opposed to granting placement authority to the President. The committee noted, however, that the President ought to have additional authority with regard to the executive schedule, so that he may respond to changes in organization, management responsibilities, or work apportionment in the executive branch. Accordingly, the bill as reported gives authority to the President to add 20 additional positions within levels 4 and 5.

Perhaps some of them would come from the regular classification list below, and some could be adjusted between level 4 and level 5.

In general, the committee endorsed the rationale of the executive salary schedule established in the House bill. Certain changes, however, were made. The compensation of Cabinet members is increased from $32,500 to $35,000, this change taking into account the heavy responsibilities of Cabinet officers and the prestige which accompanies these high positions and the necessary spending of money by Cabinet officials.

The $30,000 salary for the deputies of Cabinet members has not been changed. These are the second highest Administrators in the executive branch, in many cases the directors of the daily operations of the Nation's departments and agencies. Accordingly, they should be adequately compensated, but at a rate reflecting the differences between their duties and those of Cabinet members. The committee's action in endorsing $30,000 a year for deputy department heads and the same salary for Members of the Congress follows the traditional pay alinement in which Cabinet members are the only group paid more than Members of Congress.

The committee has reduced slightly the salaries for executives in levels 3, 4, and 5; from $29,000 to $28,500 for level 3; from $28,000 to $27,000 for level 4; and from $27,000 to $26,000 for level 5.

These are the changes in the bill as reported from the House.

It is my view that the Senate schedule more nearly reflects the responsibilities of the three lower levels and their relationship to levels 2 and 1.

The Randall panel makes clear the need for pay increases in judges, officers, and employees of the judiciary.

The committee accepted the salary scales for Federal judges enacted by the House, taking note of the fact that the increases are in the neighborhood of $7,500, the same amount of increase which was approved for Members of Congress. The committee changed the annual salary of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts from $28,000 to $27,000 and the salary of the Deputy Director from $27,000 to $26,000, in recognition of the fact that these salaries were alined with levels 4 and 5 of the executive salary schedule established at $27,000 and $26,000. Additionally, the committee reduced the salary of commissioners of the court of claims from $27,000 to $26,000.

In its discussions of compensation for the judiciary, the committee took into account the constitutional provision that Federal judges are appointed for life and that their salaries are discontinued only in the event of death, resignation, or impeachment. Thus, when Federal judges become inactive—optionally after 15 years at age 65 or after 10 years at age 70—they may, in effect, retire on full salary. It was noted also that many judges, upon reaching retirement age, continue their duties on a part-time basis while drawing full compensation.

H.R. 11049 provides pay increases for employees under the Classification Act ranging from approximately 3 percent in the lower grades, where comparability has been achieved, through 22.2 percent for grade 18, where the comparability pay line and the Classification Act pay line are still widely separated. It will be recalled that grades 16, 17, and 18, which will receive substantial pay increases under this bill, received no pay increases in January 1964 as did all other grades of the schedule.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at this point?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has been said that a large increase will be allowed to the classes just mentioned by the Senator, grades 16, 17, and 18, and that is because the last time there was a pay raise these classified workers were not included. My question is whether the large increase which is now being granted is justified. What would have been the percentage increase if it had been granted when the last increase was made and the increase that these people would be entitled to now? In other words, does the large increase now exceed what the combined increase would be if it had been granted 3 years ago and again now.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If you refer to grades 16, 17, and 18 the answer is "Yes."

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the percentage of the pay raise for this classification?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The highest would be approximately 22 percent for grade 18. However, percentage increases in the lower grades are much smaller.

Mr. LAUSCHE. 22 percent. That 22 percent compares to what in the low classification?

Mr. JOHNSTON. GS–1 gets 3.1 percent. This grade has had many increases in the years past, when the higher grades were not increased .

Mr. LAUSCHE. Class 1 would require seven increases of 3 percent to bring it up to the 22 percent that would be granted to the highest. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In that class the Government employs only 1,356 persons. Those are the charwomen, custodial laborers, and others in similar work categories. Their pay compares favorably with what they would get in private enterprise for similar work. That was all taken into consideration when the percentage increase was determined.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When was the pay raise granted that did not include the high classified people?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Grades 16, 17, and 18 received no increase in January of this year, when all other grades received an increase previously enacted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When did it happen prior to that time? Was that about 1962?

Mr. JOHNSTON. October 1962.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Were the high grades included in the 1962 pay raise?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the low grade received an increase of 3 or 4 percent in January of this year, how can we justify granting a 22-percent increase 5 or 6 months later to the high grade? I cannot follow that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Because it is the committee's view that these top officials under the Classification Act deserve an increase. The administration has advocated it. The Bureau of the Budget has advocated it. That is what we are here for.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it on the basis of comparability in private industry that this high 22 percent has been granted?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct. Even with the increase, grade 18 would be below comparability. The Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission and the President of the United States have advocated attempting to attain comparability. The House has already acted by a big majority. We are here trying to do what we think is right and just. That is what I am here to do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In addition to the increase of 22 percent, will the high classified employees in the course of time also become the beneficiaries of increased retirement pay on the basis of the new schedule?

Mr. JOHNSTON. They will, but that will be over a term of years. The retirement system provides that the 5 highest years be taken into consideration. It is the average for the 5 highest years.

A bill is pending in committee, on which some hearings have already been held, in connection with which the administration is advocating that certain changes be made in regard to the financing of the retirement system, to provide that it will be fiscally sound. The Government will have to pay more into the fund for the reason that for over two-thirds of the years of the existence of the retirement fund the Government has not been paying its full share. Another reason is that many of the employees of the Government are ex-servicemen, and they did not have to contribute toward retirement for the years of military service, but they are credited toward retirement for those years of service with the armed services. The Civil Service Commission has asked that we amend existing law to reform the method of financing the retirement fund. The committee is working on that bill

Mr. LAUSCHE. To get back to the other point, the increase that would go to Members of Congress, from $22,500 to $30,000, would also provide a new remuneration to the Members of Congress in the form of an increase in retirement pay at the end of each year. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We will go into that at a later time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been working on an amendment that I hope will appeal to the Senator. It would provide, first, that a Member of Congress, in order to obtain his increase, must certify that he is of the opinion that his services are worth that much money; second, that he believes the increase is necessary in order to provide for the essential expenses of rendering the services that are essential to his constituents and for the living expenses for himself and his dependents.

Does the Senator from South Carolina really think it is necessary to provide a pay raise for persons who feel that they might not want it, such as those who do not have children in college and do not incur expenses which might justify an increase in pay?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is a good question. I do not want to amend the bill along these lines; but I have thought at times that anyone who thinks he does not deserve the pay increase should be glad to give it back to the Government. The Government is there, waiting. That person could give back the amount of his increase. If he did not think he was worth it, he could give it back.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am aware of the position of one Member of Congress, who says that after he pays his taxes, he donates to the church whatever he has left. I do not see any particular point in giving a person a pay raise so that he can give more money to his church. In a way, that conflicts with the doctrine of the separation of church and state, if all we are doing is paying money by way of a pay raise to enable the recipient to give it to a church.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Members of the Senate and House will give back about 42 percent of the pay raise.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In income taxes?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In income taxes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would hope that we could work that out. If any Member of Congress really believes that his services are not worth the amount of the increase, he should not take it out of the Treasury; it ought to stay in the Treasury. The people ought to have an opportunity to elect some cutrate Representatives, if they wish. One could say in his platform, "I am not worth as much as another fellow. I am not worth that much salary"; and he could make his case on the basis that he is not worth that much for his services.

I hope the Senator from South Carolina will feel kindly toward my amendment. I do not feel that we should force on people money that they think is not necessary. That would be wasteful.

With that qualification, I am willing to vote for the Senator's bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator.

The substantial precentage increases for the upper grades are, in my opinion, warranted and deserved.

The committee acted to rectify what it considered an inconsistency in the House-approved general schedule, with respect to the so-called middle grades. Grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 were reduced from the President's recommendations to rates which reflect salary increases of less than 3 percent of present salary rates. Taking into account the contribution to the Federal service which is made by this important middle-management group, the committee increased the compensation of these grades to a 3-percent level. Similar increases were given the middle grades in the Foreign Service and the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

The bill has been amended to provide for 1-year step increases through step 7 for all levels of the PFS schedule. Under the 1962 act, 1-year increases through step 7 were limited to the first six levels, with 2 years being required in steps 6 and 7 for levels 7 and above. This has resulted in pay inequities caused by the longer service periods required—particularly in levels 7, 8, and 9—in steps 6 and 7 of the PFS schedule. The result has been rapidly diminishing salary differentials between level 7 on the one hand and levels 5 and 6 on the other, resulting from the fact that personnel in the lower levels advance more rapidly through the steps of the schedule.

The committee amendment will remedy these inequities and will materially benefit important groups of personnel in the postal service—supervisors, postmasters, inspectors, and others—many of whom spend the greater part of their postal careers in levels 7, 8, or 9.

The committee is in agreement with the Post Office Department that postmasters of fourth-class offices are, in general, being inadequately compensated under schedule II of the 1962 act.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

The Department's proposal to substitute a new schedule based upon PFS–5 and the number of service hours required on the part of the postmaster was carefully studied. It was the committee's view, however, that this proposed schedule, providing increases averaging approximately 27 percent, overcompensated for the deficiency. Accordingly, the act has been amended to provide for a new fourth-class office schedule, based upon six levels of revenue units. The percentage increases vary in general within the range of 10 to 15 percent, with increases substantially higher than 15 percent for postmasters of fourth-class offices in the lower levels, where increases are most urgently needed.

This modification of the Department's original proposal represents an equitable solution to the problem of marginal pay for fourth-class postmasters with low receipts, and provides significant and deserved salary increases for all other postmasters of fourth-class offices. The House-passed schedule would cost approximately $12.7 million, while that of the Senate schedule would cost approximately $4.8 million.

We took this up with the Post Office Department, too, and were informed that this would be agreeable to them.

The last pay raise granted congressional employees was an across-the-board increase of 7 percent in 1962. They received no schedule 2 increase, which, Senators will recall, was the second increment of the 1962 pay increase, becoming effective for employees of the executive branch in January 1964.

The committee has endorsed the pay-increase formula for congressional employees as set forth in the House measure. It provides for graduated raises ranging from 5 percent in the lower levels to 21½ percent in the upper. It is my belief that this schedule recognizes the principle of comparability and satisfactorily alines the pay for our congressional employees with that of officials of their rank and responsibility in the executive branch.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that in the previous pay bill, the increase in salaries for congressional workers was 7 percent?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It was 7 percent across the board.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was in 1962, was it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under that pay bill, the top salary of an administrative assistant to a Senator could be fixed at $18,884.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That was for one person in the office.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but others would get similar raises.

In the bill which the Senator now proposes to have enacted, the base pay of $8,880 and a gross rate of $18,884 would result in a 21½ percent increase for administrative assistants and cause their salaries to go up $22,945.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is more than the salary Senators receive today.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is true. We propose to raise the salaries of Senators in the bill, by 33 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. How can they justify raising the salary, let us say, of the Sergeant at Arms, who now receives $21,500, to $27,500, an increase of $6,000? How can that be justified? In addition, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, as I understand, is provided with the use of an automobile and a chauffeur.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is what the Appropriations Committee lets him have.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that; but how can the committee justify that? How can the Senator from South Carolina go back home and tell his people that the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate has been raised in salary from $21,500 to $27,500, or an increase of $500 a month, and is provided with an automobile and a chauffeur to drive it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Regarding the chauffeur and the automobile, it must be remembered that there are some occasions when the Sergeant at Arms is required to go out and advise Senators that they are needed back in the Chamber.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a car pool across the street which can be used for that purpose.

The salary of the Secretary of the Senate is to be raised from $21,500 to $27,500 or the same increase as the Sergeant at Arms—$500 a month, or $6,000 per year. How can the committee justify such an increase when an increase of 7 percent has already been given in 1962 and this increases the amount to 27.9 percent?

Mr. JOHNSTON. All this was based upon grounds of comparability.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of what?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Along lines comparable to salaries paid on the outside. Remember that this is for the whole of the Federal Government. Go to New York and see what the chief of police up there is paid.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator compare the Sergeant at Arms to the chief of police of New York City?

Mr. JOHNSTON. This position must be compared to that of those performing jobs of a similar nature, yes. I do not limit it to New York, of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice that the salary of the Architect of the Capitol would be raised from $20,700 to $26,000, or 26.1 percent.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Only 2 years ago, we gave him an increase of 7 percent. I am wondering how the committee could present the Senate with a bill of this kind. District judges will be paid $30,000, an increase of 33⅓ percent. Judgships are life appointments which is a valuable consideration in itself.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator will notice that we have reduced many salaries below those approved in the House measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Some of the what?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Some of those salaries have been cut below approved by the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about the Senate carrying out its responsibility. I know what the House did. It did a bad job. But I did not expect the committee to come before the Senate and try to duplicate what the House did—more or less, because that is just what the committee did.

Will the Senator from South Carolina tell us, assuming that every Senator will increase his force according to the tables laid out in this bill, how much it will cost a year; does the Senator know?

Mr. JOHNSTON. In this particular bill, there will be a certain amount of money which can be spent; and the Senator can spend as much of it as he wishes, in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows what happens, of course.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is what any Senator would be able to do in his office. Not a year has gone by that I have not turned back money in my own office.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same applies to me.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe that many Senators have done so. However, each Senator will be given a certain amount of money to operate his office.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why give it? Why arrange the scale so high that a Senator's administrative assistant will be constantly dissatisfied from here on out until he is paid the highest salary permitted under the bill? Some Senators give the raises automatically and this creates dissatisfaction among the assistants of those who do not.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Because many Senators cannot get the people with the abilities they need for their offices from their own particular States without paying them salaries such as will be found in this bill, and which are in relation to their abilities. That is the reason we put them in.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean to say that it is hard to get an assistant to help in his office?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator from Chicago and the Senator from New York and other places——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator does not have to pay it, unless he wishes to do so.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true that the city of New York has the same name as the State of New York——

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very proud to come from the city of Chicago but I also come from the great State of Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Illinois. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope that "Illinois" will be substituted for "Chicago."

Mr. JOHNSTON. Of course—Illinois.

Mr. ELLENDER. When I first came to the Senate, as I recall, our little pages—and I love them all—were given $5 a day for the days they worked. In this bill, their pay will be raised to more than $5,000 a year. I hope they make that much money when they get out of college.

I believe that we have gone to an extreme on this subject. I am hopeful

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

that a good look will be taken at this bill and that the Senate will make an attempt to trim it down, because I believe it is absolutely wrong, particularly when we consider that we just lowered taxes and increased salaries in 1962. Here we are, preparing to slap on the backs of the American people an additional burden which will cost in excess of half a billion dollars a year.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator will notice in the bill that many of the salaries in the Senate version are below those of the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. That does not make it good for the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. But we must keep them somewhat in line. Does not the Senator agree with that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Keep whom in line?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Salaries in the two Houses. If we do not have similar pay scales many people now working in the Senate will wish to go over and work in the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not know there was that much competition.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I address myself to the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee [Mr. JOHNSTON]. As the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I notice that there have been two changes made in the Senate bill as against the House bill.

Let me emphasize that it is not so much the money involved as much as it is the principle that concerns me. The reason I bring it up now is that I am hopeful the Senator will give some thought to the colloquy we are going to engage in, so that when I bring up my amendment we can be in accord as to what is meant.

I notice that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission has been placed in level 2. The other four members of the Commission have been placed in level 4.

The House placed the chairman in level 2, but it placed the other members of the committee in level 3.

The Senate committee dropped it down a further level.

The point I wish to make, and I believe it should be brought to the attention of the committee, is the fact that in 1954 and again in 1955—and I believe I shall be substantiated in this by my distinguished colleague from the State of Tennessee—there was a serious question which came up in committee as to what authority, perogative, and responsibility each of the five members should have. In considering the 1954 amendments to the Atomic Energy Act there was a proposal that the chairman be the principal officer of the Commission. After much debate that was not accepted.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Congress repudiated that philosophy.

We wrote in the law specifically at that time:

> Each member of the Commission, including the Chairman shall have equal responsibility and authority in all decisions and actions of the Commission and shall have one vote.

Then in 1955 so there would be no uncertainty as to the intent, the Joint Committee recommended and the Congress amended the law to read:

> Each member of the Commission, including the Chairman, shall have equal responsibility and authority in all decisions and actions of the committee, and shall have full access to all information relating to the performance of his duties or responsibilities, and shall have one vote.

Mr. President (Mr. INOUYE in the chair), the point I wish to make is that this Commission spends more than $2.5 billion a year in keeping up the nuclear and thermonuclear posture of the Nation. It is a very responsible Commission. There are some who believe, possibly, that if we had one administrator as against the commission setup, as it is in the Space Administration, perhaps it might work more effectively, but I do not believe we need to debate that questions this afternoon.

What I am intending to do and should hope that this would be amenable to the thinking of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, is to bring it back to where the House had it.

I do not say that all members of the Commission should be at level 2. I believe that the Chairman should be at level 2, as the spokesman for the Commission but I would hope the Senator would revert back when I bring up my amendment to the bill. As it was reported by the House, other members of the Commission would be put in level 3 instead of level 4.

I repeat, that it is not so much the matter of the money as it is the matter of the responsibility. If we are going to put the Chairman two grades above the other members of the Commission, we shall be downgrading the prestige and the responsibility of the other members.

I do not believe that should be allowed because I believe that would do the whole program irreparable harm.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am glad to have these remarks from the Senator from Rhode Island, and shall be glad to look into them.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the reason why I bring up the question now. I hope the Senator will take it up with his staff.

There is another point I should like to make; and I hope he will consider this, too.

I shall propose this amendment. And I hope that here again his thinking will be amenable to mine. Under the atomic energy law, we specify three Assistant General Managers. We say "no more than three." And the AEC under this statutory authority today has three Assistant General Managers. But the language of the bill, on page 127, line 5, is "Assistant General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission." That is in the singular. The only trouble is that we have three Assistant General Managers today at the equal salary level of $20,000. But the Senator provides for only one Assistant General Manager. What shall we do with the other two? We will have to downgrade them as well as others to the level of their division heads. We must treat these three General Managers alike.

I hope the staff will look into that and make this correction as well.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I shall be glad to look into that question. For the information of the Senator, we left it up to the Bureau of the Budget. The recommendation came from them.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know where they get their notions. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy watches this operation. It is not that we are trying to grab anything for anyone on the committee. But it would throw the whole organization out of kilter. We have three Assistant General Managers operating on an equal footing. It is proposed to provide for only one. What shall we do with the other two? Bury them?

The House made provision for it by leaving it to the Executive to fill an unspecified number of positions which the AEC understands would leave these three positions equal in level 5. In line 5, we could make "Manager" plural, and put "three" in parentheses. That would answer the question.

I shall make those two amendments. I hope the staff will look into that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We shall be happy to look into it. We do not claim that the bill is perfect in every sense. But we did try to do as good a job as we could, working with the departments, and with the Bureau of the Budget, and with the staff of the House.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I make no criticism of the Senator. He and I have fought shoulder to shoulder on some of these measures. At one time, I had the honor of serving on the committee. I know how assiduously the Senator has worked, and how vigorous he is in his presentations to the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I appreciate that. I discovered when the Senator was on the committee that he was one of the most active members. He did an excellent job there.

The committee amended the House bill by imposing a ceiling of $22,945 on the schedule for employees on Senators' staffs and Senate committees. The House version sets a limitation of $24,500 on employees of House committees.

The House bill further provides that the effective date of all increases in excess of $22,000 would be withheld until the effective date of the increase for Members of the Senate and House, January 3, 1965. The Committee decided that since increases in excess of $22,000, particularly in the Executive salary schedule, are of vital and immediate importance, it would be unwise to postpone the date of their disbursement. Accordingly, the bill is amended to provide that amounts of salary in excess of $22,000 per annum shall be postponed until January 3, 1965, only in the case of officers and employees of the Senate and House.

When this measure was considered on the floor of the House, Representative UDALL introduced an amendment, which was adopted, to provide that congressional pay increases would automatically go into effect in percentage amounts re-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

lated to pay increases enacted for employees and officers of the executive branch. I believe that this provision is a good try at solving a hard problem, but it is my view that it would not accomplish its apparent purpose. The committee was in agreement that this provision should be deleted from the bill.

If the proposed arrangement prevailed, the Congress would in effect be acting to raise its own salaries whenever it approved executive-branch pay increases, and those who criticize Congress whenever congressional pay is considered could once again raise their hue and cry, and the problem would be at hand once more.

I believe further that if congressional and executive pay were tied together by statute, the result might be a slowing down of consideration of warranted pay increases for employees of the executive branch.

Mr. President, a question has been raised with respect to the economic effects of this measure. I would remind those who express this concern that the comparability principle requires the Federal Government as an employer to follow the moves of the national economy—certainly not to lead it. The established procedure is for review and adjustment to determine whether salary scales have lagged too far behind those of the private economy as a whole, and to bring them up to business levels, but not above business levels, if a substantial lag has developed.

Productivity in the Federal service has been on the rise, just as it has in other sectors of the economy. For example, in the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury, production increased 13 percent from 1960 to 1962, but the manpower utilized was actually reduced by 11 percent. In the Department of Insurance of the Veterans' Administration, manpower was reduced by 22 percent between 1960 and 1962 as the result of a 23-percent increase in productivity.

It is my understanding that these reductions in manpower were accomplished through attrition and that the executive branch is continuously taking action to assure that productivity increases continue to be the rule.

It has been stated that the average weekly earnings of Federal employees are approximately $22 higher than those of employees of the States. This comparison, however, fails to take into account the differences in the employment categories involved. The functions of State governments differ markedly from those of the Federal Government. The Federal payrall at the present time includes thousands of some of the most highly trained individuals in the country. No State has a space program, for example; no State has a department of defense. Therefore, in my view it is erroneous to attempt to find a meaningful relationship between such entirely different types of groups as Federal and State employees.

Economy and efficiency in the Federal service are dependent upon the quality of Federal management, and the maintenance of high-quality management can be assured only by salary levels that will permit competent managers to remain in the service. A recent editorial in the New York Times expressed the situation in this way:

Those who oppose waste and extravagance in Government spending argue that raising the level of Federal salaries would be unjustified and inequitable. Yet the biggest single cause of waste, in Government or in private industry, is inefficient management. The Nation has been fortunate that so many skilled people have been willing to accept the financial penalties involved in Government service. But with the pay scales and fringe benefits available to high caliber personnel in private industry constantly rising, the Government will find it increasingly difficult to attract and keep executives with the talent and the training required for formulating and carrying out policy.

Mr. President, I now call to the attention of the Senate the cost of H.R. 11049, as reported. I regret to advise by colleagues that there are typographical errors in the chart displayed on page 4 of the committee report, but I am happy to point out that the erroneous figures overstate rather than understate the cost of the bill.

The total cost figure for this salary bill—verified by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission—is $556,836,341. The major reason for the difference in this cost estimate is that the net cost of title I should read $536,036,341 rather than the $543 million figure shown in the table. These estimates include the cost of Government contributions to the various fringe benefit programs Federal employees enjoy.

This is less than $13 million in excess of the amount included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1965. I have been advised that in line with the administration's policy this additional cost will be absorbed by employment attrition and efficient management of Federal agencies.

Mr. President, I have a letter from the Bureau of the Budget which I wish to read at this time:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 29, 1964.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As requested by you, the Bureau of the Budget has examined the cost estimates of H.R. 11049, as reported to the Senate. When table 4 is corrected to take into account typographical errors in title I figures, the situation is substantially as follows:

Disregarding minor adjustments which approximately cancel each other out, the aggregate costs of the Senate bill have been increased approximately $14 million over the President's maximum budget figures of $544 million for the cost of pay legislation. The additional cost is attributable to the Senate committee's action in raising the middle grades of the Classification Act, Foreign Service, and Bureau of Medicine and Surgery schedules so that they will receive a 3-percent increase. The Bureau supports this amendment in the interest of equity and closer comparability between Government positions affected and the same level of work in private enterprise.

We must point out, however, that the President's budget allowance was a maximum allowance. The fiscal year 1965 cost of the bill must be held within that figure. Accordingly, it will be necessary through attrition, nonfilling of vacancies, and other actions to increase the amount of absorption required of the agencies so as to cover the excess costs.

Subject to the foregoing understanding, the costs of the Senate version of H.R. 11049 are without objection.

Sincerely,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Acting Director.

Mr. President, I strongly believe that Americans everywhere will support the provisions of this measure as represnting equity and fairplay. I urge the Senate's favorable consideration of H.R. 11049.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to address myself very briefly to the pending bill. First, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] on the manner in which he conducted long and thorough hearings on the proposed legislation. I also commend the members of the staff for their valuable assistance in writing the pending bill.

H.R. 11049 as it passed the House was a bill of six titles. The very nature of the proposed legislation required thorough study.

I saw with a great deal of pride and frankness that every member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee gave long and sincere study to this legislation. They were determined that if a bill were to be reported, it should be reported after each member of the committee had a chance to study and discuss all titles of the bill.

The Senate committee made some changes in the House bill. We believe they were changes which make for better legislation and eliminate certain inequities.

The Senate bill gives a small increase over the House bill in four middle grades in the general schedule. This change more nearly reaches comparability and will affect grades 9, 10, 11, and 12. Many of these employees are managers and engineers. The percentage of increase will run about 3 percent.

I believe an inequity was removed from the postal field service by permitting an annual step increase through step 7 from level 7 up. Annual step increases were permitted in previous bills for the first six levels through step 7.

These are only two changes which it seems to me are significant in that they help the employees in the middle or lower brackets.

Some salaries were reduced in the executive pay schedule and a few were raised a little.

It is very difficult in a bill like this to establish a schedule entirely equitable in all instances.

Mr. President, I want to assure all my colleagues that a lot of study and effort was put forth to bring out a bill that was as nearly equitable as possible. It is now up to the Senate to cast its decision.

I shall support the bill, H.R. 11049 as reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. President, one of our colleagues, a very valuable member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Serv-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ice, is unable to be present today. He has left with me a statement in which he strongly urges passage of the measure. I have reference to the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FONG

H.R. 11049, the measure presently before this body is one which I fully support. As a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I know from first experience the hard work and long hours the committee spent to bring to the floor of the Senate as equitable a bill as was possible.

I commend the committee chairman, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, and the minority leader on the committee, Senator FRANK CARLSON, for their effective leadership and patience in hammering out a bill acceptable to all members of the committee.

It is only fair and equitable that the Congress pass the Federal Salary Act of 1964 at this time. In fact, it is overdue. In the Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962 the Congress wrote into law for the first time what is commonly referred to as the comparability principle. This provision meant that Federal salaries should be comparable to those being paid for similar work in private industry.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics was directed to make annual review of private industry salaries and report to the President its findings and comparison of Federal salaries with those prevailing in private industry.

H.R. 11049 is the first step since the comparability principle was written into law in which Congress is asked to keep faith with the provision it approved in 1962.

The committee held extensive hearings over a period of approximately 8 months on Federal pay. Upon completion of the hearings the committee met in executive sessions for over 2 months in an effort to write a fair, equitable, and just salary act.

H.R. 11049 covers the full scope of Federal salaries—from executive to clerks. It is a comprehensive measure which, while bringing most Federal salaries into comparability with those in private industry, also corrects certain inequities in the Federal pay structure.

The average salary increase for Federal employees under the Classification Act is approximately 4.2 percent and under the postal field schedule 5.6 percent.

In the higher pay levels the committee admits that comparability cannot be followed, and in other levels the Federal pay scale continues to lag 2 or 3 years behind private industry pay. However, H.R. 11049 is as equitable a bill as can now be written. It is a good bill and will assist greatly in retaining highly trained and qualified personnel in the Federal service.

I strongly urge the passage of this measure.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have wanted to vote in favor of the pending bill to increase the pay of Federal employees. I have consistently supported such measures in the past, and hope to do so again in the future. If it were possible to evaluate this bill on its own merits alone, without regard to any other consideration, I would approve it and vote for it.

But it is not possible, in my judgment, to separate this bill from other action that Congress has taken in this session. Just a few months ago, we enacted the largest income tax cut in history. This was done to combat unemployment, stimulate investment, and enhance the rate of our economic growth. The tax reduction, which had the effect of increasing everybody's take-home pay, was carefully designed to promote the growth of production and employment, so that Federal revenues, collected at a lower rate from an expanding economic base, might rise to balance the budget and eliminate further deficit spending.

On the basis of the evidence already in, we have reason to believe that the objective we sought, in enacting the tax cut, is achievable, providing we hold the line on Federal spending and avoid further cuts in tax revenue. We pledged ourselves to do both, when we cut the income tax a few short months ago. I believe we should keep that pledge today.

Last week, I kept the pledge by voting against all reductions of Federal excise taxes, even though I know these taxes to be a nuisance and harassment to the small businesses of my State. I have asked the merchants of Idaho, who so strongly desire the repeal of these excise taxes, to wait until a balanced budget is in sight. This year the deficit may run to $9 billion; next year, if we hold the line, it should be much reduced. In these prosperous times, we have to strive to restore a balanced budget, for we cannot continue indefinitely to spend more money than we take in.

I know that my stand against the repeal of the excise taxes, at the present time, was not popular with the businessmen of Idaho, and I fully appreciate that my vote against this bill will not be popular with Government employees, including the postal workers, who need the pay raise most, and who have been my special friends.

But I cannot, in good conscience, apply one standard to some of the people I represent, while applying a different standard to others. With the Government operating so much in the red, this is not the proper time to vote, either for further reduction in revenue, or for further increases in pay.

I hope that all those affected may understand that I take this position for the purpose of upholding fiscal responsibility. If we keep our pledge to hold the line, the day will soon come when Federal salaries can be adjusted, and Federal excise taxes can be repealed, without adding to the debt, or enlarging its burden upon future generations. Then is the time to do it.

I intend, of course, to apply to myself, the same standard I am asking all the people I represent to accept for themselves. Accordingly, I shall vote to strike the proposed congressional pay raise from the bill, and I shall vote against the bill itself.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is with some reluctance that I shall vote against this pending bill. My firm belief in the principle of comparability between salaries paid civil servants and those paid in private industry is evidenced by my previous votes on Federal pay legislation.

I would be pleased to vote now for salary increases for the lower and middle brackets of the classified service and for postal workers. I cannot, however, support this legislation primarily because it contains large increases for the Members of the Congress and, secondarily, because of the unfairly generous treatment of the higher grades in the classified service.

It is true, Mr. President, that congressional salaries were last reviewed a decade ago and perhaps a case can be made for some adjustment.

During the period from 1945 to 1960 there were seven across-the-board raises which averaged out annually 4.1 percent for classified and 4.9 percent for postal employees. That is a total percentage raise of 61.5 percent for the classified employees and 73.5 percent for postal.

Considering only the period since 1955 when the last congressional increase was made in Members' salaries, the percentage raise for postal and classified aggregated 51 percent. But such reasoning completely overlooks the fact that the people of this country, in the very week that the Congress has been forced to raise the legal limit of the national debt, deserve better than to have that Congress vote for ourselves a large salary increase. They deserve leadership by example. This is the time for restraint, not for new and greater expenditures.

The cost of this bill would exceed half a billion dollars. It tends to be inflationary. Both in the interests of economy and in stemming the upward spiral of living costs, it should be rejected.

This administration professes to be economy minded, yet we are continually confronted with new spending proposals, each of which contains the elements for expansion in future years. Instead of approving such measures, now is the time to reverse the trend. Yet the pressure by the administration for more and more such spending schemes continues unabated.

As the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] pointed out in his recent letter to President Johnson, despite claims by the administration that stringent personnel ceilings have been imposed, the facts are the Federal payroll is running at the rate of $16 billion a year, and going up; Federal employment is still approximately 2.5 million. This is well above the 2,352,000 jobs existing when President Eisenhower left office, after trimming 201,000 jobs from the payroll in his 8-year administration.

The Johnson administration, despite its economy claims, continues to push for more and more employees. In his fiscal 1965 budget, the President asked for new positions in 13 out of 24 major agencies.

The President must be willing to exercise restraint in his own requests both for spending and for new jobs. Then he will have earned the right to ask the people of America to reward those who make this Government operate.

Justification for higher salaries for the Congress, the top grades in the classified service, and for appointive positions is based on the argument that it is difficult to attract and maintain competent men and women in high Government posts when industry and business pay much better salaries.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. President, the motivation for Government service at these levels must be based on more than dollars and cents. A Cabinet officer undeniably is paid less than a business executive with comparable responsibilities. But, we could never expect to pay the Secretary of Labor, for example, what the giant unions pay their presidents, or to match the salary of the Secretary of Defense with the multi-hundred-thousand-dollar salary of a huge manufacturing firm.

It is reported that Gov. LeRoy Collins is leaving a $75,000 a year job as president of the National Association of Broadcasters to accept a Government post paying less than a third of that. These people come to Government positions because they are motivated by a desire to serve, not because of the salary. The same is true of the Members of the Congress.

It is unfortunate, Mr. President, that we are not allowed to consider a bill giving increases to those Government workers who unquestionably deserve them. On balance, however, the bad in this bill outweighs the good; accordingly, I shall vote against it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in my opinion, we have a solemn obligation to act favorably on this very commendable and very necessary pay bill.

When the Senate passed the Salary Reform Act of 1962, only three Members of this body voted against it. That measure committed Congress to the very sensible and reasonable proposition that Federal employees and postal employees should be relieved of the necessity of incessantly petitioning Congress to keep them abreast of the Nation's economic parade. The act, as it was passed, introduced into the Federal pay structure, for the first time, a scientific and dignified apparatus for adjusting Federal salaries whenever they fell significantly behind the accepted norm for similar jobs in private industry.

The late President Kennedy, using the apparatus we had approved, told us, on April 29 of last year, that postal employees' pay and Federal employees' pay had fallen considerably below accepted standards in private industry. We were morally committed to do something about that situation; but today, 14 months later, we are getting our first opportunity to live up to our obligation.

It was for this reason, Mr. President, that in committee I offered the amendment which was agreed to, and which will make this pay raise for the postal employees and the classified employees effective on July 1, 1964, instead of in the first pay period following the enactment of the legislation.

The fine people who man our postal service and our classified service have waited long enough for their comparability pay raise. With each passing month, they have been slipping behind the economic parade. When we pass this bill today—and I feel confident that we shall—there will have to be a conference, and then consideration by both Houses of the agreement reached by the conferees. All this adds up to more and more delay. In my opinion, it would be unconscionable for us to ask the Federal workers and the postal workers to take a further financial beating, just because in our legislative processes we have been somewhat dilatory.

Mr. President, I doubt that there can be any serious argument against the pay raises which this bill provides for Federal employees in the upper echelons of the service. All responsible authorities, both those in government and those in private industry, agree that these positions must be more attractively compensated.

The U.S. Government is the largest and the most important business operation in the world. The government is filled with positions calling for great intelligence, great judgment, great learning, and great moral courage. The decisions such men must make, as all of us know, often affect millions upon millions of human beings, both at home and abroad. Their decisions involve enormous sums of the taxpayers' money. They could conceivably involve the peace and security of the free world.

We simply cannot continue to compensate such positions with a wage that would be considered, in private industry, inadequate for an office manager or an assistant to a very junior vice president.

President Johnson has pointed out that we must prevent our Federal pay structure from becoming one that will repel the talented and will attract only the mediocre. We are perilously close to that point now. I think it is a miracle that we have been able to attract and retain the high caliber of men and women that we have today in the Government. But already the signs are becoming all too apparent that too many of the best and most talented people in the Government are finding the Federal service a luxury in which—in fairness to their families—they cannot continue to indulge. We are losing topflight people every day; and the only way we can stop this expensive exodus of talent is to make the positions more attractive than they are now.

If our huge and complex Federal Government is ever dominated by second-rate managers, we shall then be in serious danger of becoming a second-rate country.

We must repair the flaws in the present pay structure, and we must plan boldly for the future. This bill does both.

It is a good bill. Under the able leadership of our chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], our committee deliberated over its provisions in depth and at length. When we approved it, we did so without a dissenting voice or vote.

The bill deserves the same enthusiastic support from the Senate as a whole; and I sincerely hope and trust that it will receive it.

It is our moral duty to pass this bill; and it is a matter of enlightened self-interest to provide for a Federal pay structure that will attract and retain the best available talent in the land.

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN MASS SPECTROMETERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4364) to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that the Senate Finance Committee has just approved the Mansfield amendment, No. 465, to limit beet imports. The committee approved this amendment with a modification offered by Senator CURTIS. Under the amendment adopted, imports of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef after 1964 will be limited to 674 million pounds annually. This is generally the average annual amount which was imported in the 5-year period, ending with December 31, 1963. Restrictions were also placed on importation of mutton, lamb, and certain prepared meats, on a pound basis.

The amendment provides for increases in the stated quotas whenever the average price in the United States for that meat equals or exceeds 90 percent of the average parity price provided the semiannual production of cattle in this country exceeds 7,352 million pounds.

The amendment was adopted to H.R. 1839, a House-passed bill relating to the importation of wild birds and wild animals.

The bill will be reported to the Senate tomorrow.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I shall call up my amendment. Before I do so, I point out that I am very anxious to obtain the yeas and nays on the amendment. I talked with the majority leader about it. At the present time it appears that there are not enough Senators in the Chamber to order the yeas and nays. So I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call with

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor, for the purpose of bringing a sufficient number of Senators to the Chamber so that I may ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin wish first to offer his amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be called up and that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE'S amendment (No. 1084) is as follows:

Beginning with line 23 on page 108, strike out over through line 8 on page 115.

Redesignate titles III and IV as II and III, respectively; redesignate sections 301 to 310 as 201 to 210, respectively; and redesignate sections 401 to 403 as 301 to 303, respectively.

Beginning with line 4 on page 166, strike out over through line 2 on page 167 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE IV—EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 401. This Act and the increases in compensation made by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1964."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I believe there are enough Senators present to have the yeas and nays ordered.

I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendments.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLER. If the yeas and nays are ordered on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, will it be open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be open to amendment, but not modification.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment is simple. It would delete from the bill, title II, "Federal Legislative Salaries." It would eliminate that part of the bill which provides pay increases in salaries for Members of the House and the Senate and employees of the House and the Senate.

A congressional pay increase is unjustified. When I say "unjustified," I mean exactly that word. It has not been justified in the hearings or in the Randall report.

During the hearings there was a little discussion of congressional pay, but very little, indeed. I challenge any Senator to go through the hearings and find—the only one I could find was by the distinguished minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN—a statement in favor of a congressional pay increase. And even this eloquent statement is an undocumented generalized approval. The Randall report confines its justification to executive salaries.

I think a strong case was made, and a persuasive case so far as I am concerned, for an increase in salaries of executive and judicial employees. The testimony is voluminous and the comparability criterion that was introduced is most convincing. The fact is that this Government cannot hire people to serve in responsible and onerous jobs of our Federal Government if they are not paid on a basis comparable to what they can earn in private employment.

Since there last was a substantial increase for members of the Cabinet and judicial officials, there has been a great increase in salaries all over the country, but particularly in the highest salaries.

I feel very strongly that the need for a pay increase in those categories has been fully justified. It has been fully documented. It would be false economy if Congress should refuse to permit the Federal Government to pay sufficient salaries to enable the Government to hire some of the best administrators in the Nation to serve in responsible and important positions, in which persons could exercise their judgment in securing efficiency and economy.

But the same argument cannot be made for Members of the House and the Senate. This is a most difficult issue to debate, because we are all involved. It is difficult for us to argue against a pay increase for Members of the House and Senate.

I cannot think of anything that would make one lose popularity among one's colleagues more than to argue against a pay raise for them. In fact, I am having trouble with my wife on this issue. I am sure that those who vote for my amendment will find they may have trouble with their wives, children, or other members of their family who disagree. So it is not easy to make this argument. But the fact is that a pay increase is not necessary for Members of the House and Senate.

A Member of the House or Senate now receives $22,500 a year. That pay is three times as high as the income of the average American family. Only 1 family out of 50 in the Nation receives as much as $22,500 or more.

When one is paid this handsomely in any line of work, really the only justification to pay more is that we must pay more if we are to get the people to do the job. That is the justification for the increase for Cabinet officers and judicial officers. But the same justification cannot be made for Members of the House and Senate.

We all recognize the great expense involved in running as a candidate for the House or Senate. Why? Because there is great competition for the job. Candidates for the House and their supporters are willing to contribute, typically, $25,000 or $30,000, for a single campaign. In many States candidates for the Senate will conduct campaigns that cost $250,000 or $300,000, and some Senate campaigns cost $1 million or more.

On the basis of competence and efficiency, I should say that the services of virtually all Members of the Senate could be valued abstractly at $50,000 or $100,000, or even more. Most Members of this body could make more on the outside than we make here. We have chosen to serve in this body because we like it, because the nonmonetary rewards are far greater than the monetary rewards. There is no question of the satisfaction that comes from serving in the Senate, in being one's own boss, in not being an administrator appointed by somebody else, of being able to work in accordance with one's own conscience, of, in effect, choosing one's own field, and devoting time and attention to it and meeting the great challenges that face our country in being a top American policymaker. That is the real compensation. Whether the salary were increased to $30,000, or $50,000, or $100,000, the incentive to run as a candidate for the Senate or the House in my judgment, would not be substantially increased.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have a tabulation in my hand showing the pay increases that were granted generally to the Federal employees beginning in 1955. If I am incorrect in this statement, those who are experts in the matter may challenge me.

In 1955 a 7.5-percent pay raise was granted to the general employees.

In 1958 a 10-percent increase was granted.

In 1960 a 7.7 percent increase was granted.

In 1962 a 5.5-percent increase was granted, effective in 1962, with the provision for a 4.4-percent increase effective in 1964.

These figures show that since 1955 the general employees have received, in the aggregate, pay raises amounting to 35.1 percent.

I come now to the pay raises granted to Members of Congress.

In 1955 the pay was raised from $12,500 to $22,500.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The salary was $12,500, with an allowance of $2,500 for expenses, but the salary was $12,500, according to the report submitted.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Senator will yield for a correction, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 established a $15,000 salary for Members of the Senate and House. At that time, in 1946, Members were enjoying a salary of $10,000 plus a $2,500 allowance. When the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed a $15,000 salary superseded the old salary, and that was the salary until the time it was raised to $22,500 in 1955.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, it was $12,500, with $2,500 for an allowance. What does the Senator from Oklahoma say it was then?

Mr. MONRONEY. Then it was $15,000 salary, and the expense allowance ceased to exist.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In 1955 the salary was $15,000. Then it was raised to $22,500. That is a 50-percent increase. It is now proposed to raise it from $22,500 to $30,000. That is a 33⅓-percent pay raise over 1955. If we take the $15,000 pay in 1955 and compare it with the $30,000 in 1964, the pay raise is 100 percent. How can we go back to the taxpayers and voters and say that we have granted, in the aggregate, a 35-percent pay raise to the general employees, but have granted to ourselves a 100-percent

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

pay raise? I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin how he can answer conscientiously anyone who challenges him on the basis that he gave a 100-percent pay raise in 9 years to himself and gave the little postal carrier and the janitor and the washwoman 35 percent in the aggregate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. In general, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio. But I do think that on the basis of the Randall report and on the basis of the hearings, it is possible to justify a substantial increase for members of the Cabinet and some of the other leading administrators in our Government, on the comparability basis. It is a matter of judgment, but I think the Randall people were efficient. I think they were honest. I think they were objective. I believe that when they said that if we wish to have the kind of people who are competent to do important administrative and judicial work, it is necessary to pay them approximately, they were right. I accept that.

Some of the increases are very substantial. I reject the principle that it is not possible to increase the salary of a Cabinet officer, and the salary of the other people in the Federal Government with responsible jobs, without at the same time increasing the salaries of the Members of Congress by the same amount. The jobs are entirely different. There is no comparability.

No member of a State legislature gets anything like the salary that we do.

It is true that when we get into the area of administrative jobs, we find that in California and in Illinois and in Pennsylvania, for example, in some cases 90 or 100 people get more than $25,000 a year. They are administrators. Those States have found that the only way they can get competent people is to pay them an additional sum.

For ourselves, I do not find any justification for the proposed increase.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot find any justification for the disparity that exists between the aggregate pay raises that were granted in 10 years to the general employees, amounting to 35 percent, while we are granting to ourselves an increase of 100 percent. We are in no different category so far as want and need are concerned.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On the basis of want and need there is no question about it. I feel strongly, and I have felt very strongly for years, that the rank and file Federal employees deserve better pay. We can justify it on the basis of justice and need, and that it is necessary to do it in order to get people who fill comparable jobs outside the Government. But the only way we can justify paying more than $20,000 a year is that a pay increase is necessary to pay that amount to attract qualified officials. The argument can be made, on the basis of the Randall report, that it is necessary to pay the additional amount to get the people who are competent to handle the important sub-Cabinet and Cabinet jobs.

That argument cannot be made with regard to Members of Congress.

If I run for reelection this fall I will have a very strong opponent, and most Members of Congress will also. All of us are well aware of the fact that there is plenty of competition when it comes to these jobs we hold.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator lost all of his staff members, does he think there would be others available in Wisconsin to work for him on the basis of the pay that he is now paying his staff members, without an increase?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe that is true in my case, too. I believe every Member of Congress has 10 applicants for every job he has available in his office. I should like to ask the Senator one more question. In addition to this pay raise of 100 percent in 10 years, I have before me a tabulation of what my retirement pay and the retirement pay of the Senator from Wisconsin will be. He has served 6 years. At the end of 6 years it is $281.25 a month. With the increase in the salary from $22,500 to $30,000, the retirement pay would be $406.25. That is for that 6 years' service. At the end of 12 years, on the basis of $30,000, my retirement pay would be $30,000 times 2½ percent times 12 years. It would be $6,000 a year. The point I am trying to make is this: Is it not a fact that in addition to the increase in pay, we would eventually become the beneficiaries of a liberal increase in our retirement pay?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question about that. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We would become the beneficiaries of a liberal increase in retirement pay without having to pay anything into the retirement fund to support that increased pay.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There would be some increase, but nothing in proportion to what we would get out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We would pay in nothing on the basis of past service. We would pay on the basis of future service.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, is it not a fact that we pay in about 7½ percent?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But only on the future salary. We do not pay it on the past salary.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator has found a different way of doing it. Apparently he has a new way of doing it, because I have been paying into the fund for 18 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us make this point clear. A person who goes to work for the Federal Government at $5,000 a year and pays in 2½ percent on his $5,000, and finally works himself up to a $15,000 salary, has his retirement calculated on the $15,000, on which he did not, through his entire service, pay 2½ percent, and not on the basis of the $5,000.

Mr. MORTON. That does not apply alone to Members of Congress. That applies to the entire Federal pension plan. It is figured on the basis of the average of the top 5 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is why the Federal pension fund is in the red in the sum of $39 billion.

Mr. MORTON. If that is so, let us rewrite the law.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is not $39 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is underfunded in the sum of $39 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kansas, for a clarification of this point.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not want to get into an argument between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Wisconsin. However, readers of the RECORD should have the facts stated accurately. The Senator is really a little low in some of his figures.

Since 1955 there have been six salary increases for Federal employees, including increases of 7.5 percent in 1955, 8.1 percent in 1956, 10 percent in 1958, 7.7 percent in 1960, 5.5 percent in 1962, and 4.1 percent that became effective on January 1, 1964. That aggregates more than 51 percent.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has mentioned congressional increases in salary. The salary in January 1955 was $22,500. Therefore, a salary of $30,000 would not be a 100-percent increase; it would be an increase of 33 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; I stated that clearly. If it was $15,000 in 1955, and would become $30,000 in 1964——

Mr. CARLSON. It was $15,000 in 1946.

Mr. MONRONEY. The salary of Members of Congress was changed in March 1955. It is necessary to compare the salaries correctly by using the same base period; for example, the increase in 1955. It will be found that about the same amount of increase, about 35 percent, has been given to all Federal workers regularly throughout the 10-year period.

Under the committee's proposal, Members of Congress would receive an increase of about 33 percent effective January 1, 1965. Members of Congress did not receive an increase in 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, or 1960. Their salaries were increased in 1955. So let us keep the figures straight. The percentage is approximately concomitant between the starting figure in 1955 and the amounts by which Federal workers in the civil service have been raised during the intervening period and what is now proposed to be effective in 1965, a 33-percent increase.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment is designed to correct all the inequities in the bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure there are many inequities in the bill at which the amendments of other Senators are aimed. My amendment is aimed at the title dealing with Federal legislative salaries, title II.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are we to assume that if the Senator's amendment were adopted, he would favor the bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not understand the Senator's reasoning.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall favor the bill whether my amendment is adopted or not. I hope the amendment will be

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

adopted; but I shall vote for the bill anyway, because I think it is so badly needed to get and retain the kind of efficient people needed in the Federal Government. I am for the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I disagree with the Senator so far as he says it is necessary to raise salaries in order to get efficient personnel for the Government. People are running over themselves wanting to get into the Government, just as they are running over themselves trying to be elected to Congress.

I do not disagree with the Senator in the main; but if his amendment is adopted and the bill is passed, he will be voting a pay raise for his admiinstrative assistant to a limit that is higher than the Senator's own salary now.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; that is not correct. I would delete all of title II, which affects administrative assistants and all other Senate employees.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I though the Senator said his amendment affected only Senators and Representatives.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I was misunderstood. The amendment affects not only Members of the Senate and House; it would not permit an increase in pay for congressional staff members and would not permit increases in pay for Members of the House and Senate.

The Senator from Arkansas makes a good point. I think it is necessary to keep salaries in line.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The salaries of members of the Senate staff, under the bill, would be higher than salaries Senators now receive.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But my amendment would prevent that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the Senator's amendment apply to all Members of Congress?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It applies to the salaries of Members of the Senate and House and to all other legislative salaries. All legislative salary increases are deleted by my amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the Senator's amendment, would the members of the staff, from the lowest to the highest paid, receive no increase at all, whether in the House or the Senate?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The answer is no. No increase. Of course, there is the possibility that a Senator who now has extra clerk hire available might increase his staff members, but my amendment would not by itself provide an increase in salaries for employees of the legislative branch.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the Senator's amendment allow the $7,500 increase for Cabinet officers?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. As I understand, the Senator's amendment would preclude any increase in salaries for Members of the House and Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Members of the Senate and House and the staff.

Mr. PROUTY. I am sympathetic toward the Senator's position with respect to congressional salaries; but I believe some justification can be made for a reasonable increase in staff salaries. So at the proper time I shall offer a substitute which would eliminate the provision for an increase in congressional salaries; and if that should be adopted, I shall offer a second amendment, which would permit an increase in staff salaries up to $22,000. In other words, the staff would not receive more than Members of Congress receive.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would be $500 less.

Mr. PROUTY. That would be up to the Senate to determine.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the committee did its work carefully, as it has always done in the past, to try to bring the salary payments, not only of the staff of other employees of the Senate, in proper relationship to what Senators receive. So we either must cut out the whole thing or, in effect, cut out nothing. Otherwise there will be a large number of employees of the Senate and of Senators who will receive, under the amendment the Senator from Vermont proposes to offer, more than Senators receive.

Mr. PROUTY. I wish to ask the Senator another question. A Senator does not have to grant an increase to his staff members if he does not wish to do so, does he?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; but there are doorkeepers and others, who are not responsible to any one Senator, who would be paid more than Senators are paid under the Prouty amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for offering his amendment. I have been a Member of the Senate for a relatively short time—7½ years. In that time, I have consistently supported and voted for legislation designed to update the pay scale and fringe benefits of our Federal workers to insure them a standard of living equal to and commensurate with their counterparts in private industry.

Specifically, since 1957, Congress has passed three pay-increase bills which have increased the pay of Federal employees by a total of 27½ percent. These included a 10-percent increase in 1958, a 7½-percent increase in 1960, and a 10-percent increase in 1962, a part of which took effect only on January 1 of this year.

We are now informed that the pay of Federal workers is again lagging behind that of those in private life who are doing similar work and, therefore, are being called upon to further increase these salaries. In addition to classified and postal employees, the bill includes increases, some as high as 33 percent, for Members of Congress and leading members of the executive branch and the judiciary, including members of the Supreme Court.

My inquiry has verified the fact that the bill would increase the salaries of the pages sitting in front of us to $5,004 a year. I do not see how anyone can justify that.

The bill comes to us in revised form after a previous bill, which provided even larger increases for high officials in the executive branch and Members of Congress, was defeated in the House earlier this year.

I support the principle of comparability between Government and industry and of paying a salary which is sufficient to attract qualified people to serve the Federal Government. I believe that the bill, in providing a one-third increase for Members of Congress, with similar increases for the executive and judicial branches, goes far beyond that point and, in fact, is completely unreasonable in this respect.

I point out that in addition to our salaries, the Government contributes 7½ percent toward our retirement benefits, which is a fringe benefit vested after only 5 years of service. The able Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], in an earlier colloquy with the Senator from Wisconsin, stated in detail how beneficial this is to all Members of Congress. If the salary of $30,000 is retained in the bill as it came to the Senate, 7½ percent of that, in addition, will be contributed by the taxpayers of the country toward our retirement benefits, and it will be vested after only 5 years of service.

Only last week, this body voted to increase the national debt ceiling to an all-time high of $324 billion.

In the past 34 years, we have balanced the Federal budget only about six times. It has been unbalanced 28 times. • Although the exact figures will not be available for some time yet, I am informed that the fiscal year which ended at midnight last night, will probably show a deficit in excess of $8 billion, 800 million. It is estimated to be approximately $6,600 million for this fiscal year.

In the face of this kind of national financial picture, I cannot in good conscience vote for a bill which, among other things would increase my own salary by one-third, and in its present form would cost the taxpayers over one-half billion dollars annually.

I hope that the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, to strike the exorbitant increases for Members of Congress and to bring into reasonable proportion the increases for other Federal officials, will be adopted.

In the event that it is, I shall be glad to support the bill.

In the event that it is not approved, I cannot vote for it.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Georgia very much.

Before I yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr CARLSON], let me say that the point the Senator from Georgia makes about the effect of this proposal on responsible fiscal policy is particularly important. Not only have we the problem of the national debt, but only a few months ago we voted the biggest tax cut in the history of the Nation, a tax cut which certainly will deepen the deficit for this year, at least. There is no question about that.

The tax cut not only benefited many Americans, but it also benefited Members of

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Congress far more handsomely than most Americans.

My staff people have computed that a typical Member of Congress, if he has no outside income, received the benefit from the tax cut of increased take-home pay of $18 a week, or $900 a year, which is a far greater increase than the overwhelming majority of the American people received from the tax cut.

It will be remembered that when we voted for the tax cut, it was made explicit that we would do everything we could to cut down Federal spending. How in the world can we honestly say we are working to keep Federal spending down if we vote ourselves a 33⅓ increase in salary?

There might be a time for this kind of increase later, but not this year, not in a year when we have already voted a heavy tax cut, when we have deliberately planned to unbalance the budget to the extent that we have.

I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to participate in this debate, because the salaries of the very young men who serve us on both sides of the aisle have been mentioned. These boys receive $387.11 a month. They serve during the sessions of the Congress. They serve an entire year at their present salary—12 months. At $387.11 a month, the total for the year is $4,655.40.

This bill would increase the salaries of these young men, following the pattern of other salaries, by $29 a month. It is true that it would total a little over $5,000—$5,004.60.

The record should be made clear that these boys are serving by the month. If the session lasts 12 months, that is the salary they would get.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my support for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. There should be no question in the minds of the American people and those of us in this body on the justification of the proposed pay raises for the postal workers and the classified employees. Whether based on merit, comparability, or cost-of-living increases, Federal employees who are legally denied the opportunity to use the bargaining techniques of their counterparts in private industry, deserve fair and thorough consideration at this bargaining table. We should be directing our attention to this question and this alone.

Inclusion of the congressional pay raise in this bill is totally inappropriate. Any such increase for Congress involves entirely different considerations and should be voted up or down on its own merits. If there is no justification for an increase at this time, then it certainly should not ride through on the legislative coattails of merited increases.

Entirely apart from the merits of whether we are entitled to more money or not, the fact is that there is virtually nothing in the hearings record dealing with the question of congressional pay raises. Whether the figure of a 33⅓-percent increase was picked out of thin air and whether it may be justified or not is unknown.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. That is exactly what this congressional raise is—legislative coattail riding.

Look at the hearings. There is virtually no justification for a congressional increase. There is some justification for an increase in the executive and judicial departments. Many prominent organizations and persons have appeared and documented the case for executive and judicial pay increases. However, there is no justification for the increase for Members of Congress. It has been argued that if we increase the salaries of the executive and the judicial branches, we should also increase the congressional. Why? Why?

We increase the salaries of the executive and the judiciary, therefore we have to do it if we are to get competent people to do the job in those two branches of our Government. That argument does not apply to Congress.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator is correct. Let me add one comment. I would prefer to have this amendment apply only to Members of Congress. I understand the problems to which the Senator's amendment is directed. But, in my judgment, the staff members as employees of Congress are deserving of increased compensation now. It would be preferable to adopt the substitute proposal of the Senator from Vermont, which is limited to Members of Congress.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from New York. I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am strongly in favor of increasing the pay for postal and classified personnel, and also for the judiciary. But I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin to eliminate legislative salary increases. Nevertheless, I believe it should be realized that the actual take-home pay of a Senator or Representative is very much less than commonly believed, after he meets the necessary political expenses of his office. I do not believe that any Senator who votes for an increase in pay should be singled out by the voters, or by anyone else, for condemnation. Nevertheless, for a number of reasons, I am opposed to this increase for Members of Congress. I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I am keenly aware of the difficulties of living on our present congressional salary after meeting the necessary costs of such items as: First, trips back home and travel inside the State, plus, second, the cost of radio and television reports, third, the entertainment in Washington of constituents; fourth, donations to charitable organizations and causes which are expected, and, indeed, almost demanded of public officials; and, fifth, contributions to party funds and to the campaigns of other candidates. After these deductions together with income taxes and contributions to the retirement fund are subtracted from the salary of $22,500, my actual take-home pay in nonelection years is almost never above $7,000 and in election years even less.

All this is a strong argument for an increase in congressional salaries and I do not have the slightest criticism either expressed or implied for those of my colleagues who so vote. But I cannot bring myself to do so for the following reasons:

First. We in Congress have some opportunity for legitimate outside earnings. It is true that the work in Congress is steadily increasing and is at times almost crushing. But there are still opportunities, on weekends, and when Congress is not in session, to earn additional modest amounts in law practice, business, writing, and lecturing. Any danger of a consequent conflict of interest with one's duties as a Congressman can largely, if not entirely, be averted by requiring full disclosure of outside income and ownership as Senator MORSE and I advocated many years ago and as is now being urged by Senators CASE, NEUBERGER, CLARK, and KEATING.

Second. We should remember that with all our financial difficulties we in Congress are still in a very favored economic position. We should never forget that at least 40 million Americans, or slightly over 20 percent, are living in poverty and that 90 percent of American taxpayers have incomes under $10,000 a year. Probably less than 2 percent have an income of $30,000 for which we are now asked to vote. And yet we are supposed to represent the great bulk of the American people. The danger is that if we provide a salary of $30,000 for ourselves, then it will be easy for us to think as $30,000 a year men customarily do—and to forget what it feels like to live as do the overwhelming majority of our fellow Americans whose interests we should have at heart.

Third. Finally, I resent esthetically being put in a position where I must vote on my own salary. No one with any personal dignity likes to exercise the power he possesses to vote himself an increase. I am willing to vote for an increase to others, and, indeed, I favor the other portions of the pay bill, but I would prefer that any increases in congressional salaries should come primarily from others, such as on the recommendation of an impartial committee. I know that in the present instance this is almost impossible to effect and that we are now compelled to decide on our own condition. In addition to the reasons which I have stated, I would therefore have a certain squeemishness in voting myself an increase, however justified this might be on other grounds.

For these reasons I shall support the motion to eliminate congressional salary increases from the bill. But I wish to add that in my judgment there should be no condemnation of those Senators who do vote for the increase and against the amendment. For I know from experience just how difficult the problem is for those without large private resources and that this is particularly hard for those with large families to support and educate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina, chairman of the committee, who has been patiently waiting for a long time. I apologize to him.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I should like to follow up what the Senator from Illinois has just stated. When we put the $7,000 on top of the present salary rate, we find that we would receive only 58 percent of the increase. The rest of it will be taken out for income taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may seem to be arguing in part against myself, but, as I stated, if we deduct the expenses of trips back home, travel inside our States, the cost of radio and television reports, entertaining our Washington constituents, donations to charitable organizations, the cost of which is expected—indeed, is almost demanded of public officials—and legitimate and proper contributions to party funds, and to the campaigns of other candidates, there is not much left. I believe that this does make a strong case for an increase. Nevertheless, I am opposed to the increase. I am not given to self-flagellation, but I am opposed to the increase, the reasons for which I have explained.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the Senator from Illinois that although he is supporting my amendment, he has made the strongest argument against it that has been made yet.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is much to be said for such an increase since this is a complicated question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is, indeed, but this extraordinarily judicious and judicial cast of mind is typical of the senior Senator from Illinois. It is typical of his approach to all questions.

In reply, however, our TV, newsletter, and other reporting to our constituents is strictly voluntary. Certainly it is voluntary in the view of those against whom we run. This reporting is a fine thing in democracy. But it is construed by many as self-serving. Some Senators do not ever make a TV or newsletter report to their constituents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is perhaps the greatest traveler in the Senate. I do not know any Senator who is more energetic than he in getting back home to see his constituents. I shall not inquire what his travel bill is, but it must be very large judging from my own travel bill which amounts to approximately $3,000 a year. I think all these items should be taken into consideration. But, nevertheless, since we can have legitimate outside occupations in which to increase our income we Senators are still in a very favorable economic condition in comparison with other citizens of the United States. It is humiliating to be forced to increase one's own salary. There is an esthetic objection which I have to that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, about a half hour ago I was challenged rather vigorously as to the correctness of my statement with regard to when the pay raises were put into effect.

Since that time, I have had copies of the acts brought to me. I submit that the acts will demonstrate without any question that the salaries of Congressmen in 1946–57 was $12,500. I have here Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress, chapter 753, 2d session. This law was passed as the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That is the act which the Senator from Oklahoma said provided for a salary of $22,500.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma said nothing of the kind. I stated it provided a salary of $15,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. All right. Let me read what it states:

Effective on the day on which the 80th Congress convenes, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $12,500 per year.

That is what I said. The language of the act definitely establishes the correctness of what I said. I further stated that it was in 1955 that the salaries were raised from $12,500 to $22,500.

I have here Public Law 9 of the 84th Congress, chapter 9, 1st session, House Resolution 3828. The act was approved by the President on March 2, 1955. This provides:

The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

A half hour ago I stated that the salaries in 1946 were $12,500. They were raised in 1955 to $22,500. They are now intended to be raised to $30,000. These laws speak for themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 4. (a) Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $22,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $35,000 per annum."

(b) Section 601(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (relative to expense allowances of Members of Congress), is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President) is amended by striking out "$30,000" and substituting therefor "$35,000".

SEC. 5. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on March 1, 1955.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT PAY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Compensation of Members of Congress

SEC. 601. (a) Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $12,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum each.

(b) Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes there shall be paid to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to, or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall incur, or accounting be made; such sum to be paid in equal monthly installments.

(c) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Representative and Delegate, and to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, after January 2, 1945, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments.", is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

(d) The sentence contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, which reads as follows: "There shall be paid to each Senator after January 1, 1946, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments.", is hereby repealed, effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I repeat that from $12,500 to $30,000 is a $17,500 increase since 1945, or 140 percent.

If those who challenge me—and I see them on the floor—can find any written law, and not their memory, I wish they would find it and show it to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before I yield further, in order that we might have some order in this debate, I would ask other Senators who ask me to yield, to make their statements brief, if they would, or wait until I yield the floor. Then, if they want to carry on a debate, they can carry it on themselves. The way this debate is being conducted now, with this Senator farming out the floor, is not an orderly way to proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Senator consider a time limitation on a vote on the amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator from Ohio is willing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will be here late on this one amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No. I object because I found myself running out of time on every occasion when an important vote was up.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator from Ohio would yield for a minute, I think the Senator from Montana only mentioned a time limitation on my amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. As far as I am concerned, it does not make a bit of difference to me. I know what I shall do. The Senators can speak from now until doomsday. I shall still vote the same way. We shall stay late tonight. If the Senators do not want to get on to a vote on the amendment, it is no skin off my nose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will accept any limitation that the majority leader wants

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

to impose. Would the Senator from Ohio be amenable?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would be willing to talk about it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the majority leader propose a time limitation on this one amendment alone?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would like, on this one amendment, to propose that we vote on this amendment at 6 o'clock.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have a substitute to this amendment. I do not like to delay it. It will not take me very long. But I want to protect myself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Excuse me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on page 217 of the Senate hearings on the Federal pay legislation, it is shown that the pay scale of 1946 was $15,000, the total compensation being $15,000. According to footnote 5, this includes a $2,500 expense allowance which was tax free until 1953, when it was made taxable under the provision of the Revenue Act of October 20, 1951.

This allowance was discontinued effective March 1, 1955, by the same legislation which increased the salary rate for Members of Congress to $22,500. So, the record is absolutely clear that the pay that Members received was a total of $15,000, $2,500 of which was tax free at that time.

It was tax free at that time and it was changed by the Revenue Act of 1951 and made subject to the normal income tax. So we are talking about a salary of $15,000 up to 1955, at which time it was changed to $22,500.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I rise briefly in order that the record may be corrected in connection with the statements made by my distinguished colleagues, from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and New York [Mr. KEATING], to the effect that the hearings disclose no compelling arguments for increases for the Members of the Congress of the United States.

I refer to May 18 of this year when the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], appeared before our committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will permit an interruption, I should like to say that the Senator from Wisconsin specifically mentioned the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and said that he did make an appearance on congressional salary increases. As usual, it was very effective and eloquent appearance. But I said that that was the only appearance in favor of the congressional increase that I could find. And that appearance was not documented. So far as I can find, no organization appeared to document and support specifically the proposed congressional pay increase.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Randall Commission had done so. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] referred to that study. I did not hear all of the Senator's prepared speech of today. I only heard him say in his colloquy with the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] that there had been no argument advanced during the hearings for a congressional pay increase. I heard that only a few moments ago. I repeat a very valid argument was made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] before our committee. President Lyndon Johnson has effectively and energetically advocated an increase for Members of Congress. Perhaps there are a few Senators who voted to decrease their salaries while they were Members of the Congress of the United States. In 1933 I served with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as Members of the House. I voted to decrease our salaries to $8,500 a year. So from time to time we have the opportunity and the responsibility to act. We are charged by the Constitution of the United States with setting our salaries. It is a task we must meet by law.

I find no fault with any Senator who disagrees with our committee in its bill. However, I remind the Senate that the Senator from Illinois advocated not the $7,500 increase included in the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and as contained in the measure. He recommended an increase to $10,000. I think that point should be included as a part of the RECORD. I emphasize that I have no disposition to argue with a colleague on this subject. It is a challenge that, very frankly, we should vote on. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said, in essence, that in a few minutes or a few hours we will vote as we believe. I believe any Senator knows whether he or she will vote for or against an increase.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is perfectly right when he says that the committee did exercise discretion in not going as high not only as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] recommended but as high as the Randall Commission recommended.

The President of the United States also recommended a $10,000 increase for Members of Congress. I am not saying that the committee was particularly excessive, but I do say that neither in the hearings nor in the report of the Randall Commission—and I have the report beginning on page 12 of the hearings—could I find any justification for the proposed congressional increase except, as the Senator from New York so well said, it was a free ride on the increase for the executive and the judicial branches. There was no specific justification for the proposed congressional pay increase.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not true that in the opinion of the Senator from Wisconsin each and every Senator knows exactly whether he or she will vote for or against the proposed congressional pay increase?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. That is why I was ready to vote on the question some time ago and why I was ready to agree to a request for a time limitation on the debate as proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the proposed pay raise is justified, and I shall vote for it.

I have in my hand my income tax return, which Senators are free to look at. The return has been checked by representatives of the Federal Government. I have been one of the guinea pigs.

In my 1960 return I have itemized my deductions. The Government looked over the return. They disallowed about $100 or $200, I believe, by the time they got through examining the returns.

On the return I have listed such expenses as my home office expenses; additional telephone and telegraph; public service broadcast, in connection with which I paid for the film, although the station ran it free of charge as a public service; publication clipping service, so that I could see what a low rating I have been getting from the newspapers in my State, and occasionally a complimentary remark; photographs sent out to someone who thought enough of me as to wish a picture that they could hang on the wall; petty cash for the office staff, and that sort of thing; entertaining constituents; dues to professional organizations; unreimbursed office expenses that I incurred.

All of those expenses add up to $28,078. My salary was not exactly $22,500 because I received some additional allowances, such as postage, on which I made a little money. Some allowance should be made for that. I grossed $24,000 and my expenses were $28,078. So the best I can make of it is that I was $4,000 in the red.

Those figures demonstrate that I have not allowed anything to send my daughter to college. No allowance has been made to operate my home in Louisiana. The figures did not allow for transportation back and forth from home to office and personal expenses. Nothing of that sort is included.

What I have stated is what I can deduct because I had the expenses that go with being a U.S. Senator.

Last year I made out better. I think I actually came out better by about $3,000. But I am the lowest paid man in my office. In other words, by the time the expenses are considered, the boy who runs errands betwen my office and the Senate Chamber is paid twice as much in terms of net income, as I am paid.

Mr. President, I believe I should make a few dollars out of the job. It is most difficult for the Senator from Louisiana to explain to his wife why he is serving for a minus income. I am donating my services because I love the country and the job.

Some Members of Congress are bachelors and some have children who are away, supporting their own families, and are doing so adequately.

Mr. President, I am having prepared an amendment which I shall offer, which will provide that before a Member of Congress receives the proposed pay raise, he will sign a statement, first, that he is

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

of the opinion that his services justify his receiving the proposed pay raise.

Second, that unless he receives the pay raise, he will not be able to meet his essential expenses of providing the services that he is trying to provide for his State, his constituents, and his Nation as a Senator. If he really did not believe that, and if he could not subscribe to that statement, he would not receive the increase. For example, he may be like my friend on the House side, whose name I shall not mention, even though he makes no secret of his attitude. According to his own statement, he gives his entire salary to the church. After he pays his taxes, whatever he has left over he gives to the church. He is working for God and the country. If all we are doing is acting upon a proposed pay increase in order that Members of Congress may donate more to the church, I could not go along with the proposal because it would violate the principle of separation of church and state. [Laughter.]

We should not pass a pay raise bill which would merely put more money into a church's till.

But if some Member of Congress has need of the increase in order to provide the service that is expected of him and that he would like to provide for his constitutents, then he should be able to state that he is worth that amount of money to the country for the services he is rendering and that the expenses he incurs actually justify his receiving the increase. I would not require that a man make money in his private endeavors in order to carry the expenses of being a U.S. Senator. The salary should be adequate so that one could give up his law practice, if that were his sole source of income, in order to serve his country as a Senator. On that basis I expect to vote for the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has said that in 1960 his expenses were $28,000. Obviously the proposed $7,500 increase would not be nearly enough. On that basis it could be argued that if our salary were $40,000 it would not be sufficient.

We are outgoing people. We love to entertain our constituents, to serve our constituents, and to report to our constituents. We would find ways of spending that much and more. But this kind of spending is voluntary. It is usually political. And it is frequently self-serving.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My amendment would make it possible for my friend from Wisconsin to be a cutrate Senator. He could say, "If the people up there don't want me, they can vote for someone else, but I come cheaper." [Laughter.]

Let us consider some Members who are not really worth the money paid. They attend only about half the rollcalls. They would not need to certify that they were worth the money. They could then do their job at a lower figure. They could say, "I have not done much. I have not been very constructive, but look at all the money you are saving with me in Congress. It will not cost you much to have me around." A man could be a cutrate Member of Congress under my amendment. [Laughter.]

I hope there will be some. I am satisfied that there are some Members of Congress who are not worth that money.

On the other hand, the last two Presidents of the United States have been Members of the Senate. My guess is that as Senators they worked as diligently to discharge their duties to our country as they did when they were President. When President Lyndon B. Johnson was sitting in the seat now occupied by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], he tried to serve his country as well as he is now doing in the White House, although now he receives in pay several times what he made then as a Senator.

Mr. President, unless I miss my guess, though it is the same man, he is worth a great deal more money because it was the decision of the people to put him where he is.

Some of these people are being very inadequately paid, while other people are being paid too much. I am going to offer an amendment that will leave it to the conscience of Members of Congress as to whether they should get such pay or not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall be delighted to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. I am sure all 100 Senators will feel free to vote for it. When it becomes law we can cheerfully sign to the effect that our services justify our salaries, and that our services are essential to the Nation.

I said before that I thought the services of Senators are worth $50,000 or $100,000, but we know that we do not have to increase the pay of Senators to persuade them to serve here. There is much competition, outstanding competition—too strong competition—for this office. Therefore, there is no justification for paying a salary increase of a whopping one-third when a Congressman already makes more than what 98 percent of the people of America receive.

The Randall Commission made the case for the executive department. It did not make a case for Members of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, instead of providing that a Member should certify as to what he thinks he is worth, should provide that the people back home should say how much they think he is worth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That would be a dangerous amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I want to support the Senator from Wisconsin in his pending amendment. I think a pay raise for Members of Congress should be decided on its own merits, without being a coattail rider to this bill. Some employees of the Government will be getting less than a 1.6-percent increase. I do not know why we should hook on a 33⅓-percent increase for Members of Congress as a rider to this bill. I think a pay raise for Members of Congress should be considered as a completely separate bill. I would like to support portions of the pending bill.

There is nothing in the law which requires a Member of Congress to spend $8,000, $10,000 or $15,000 to advertise himself and to help get himself reelected. If Members of Congress want to be reelected they should pay for it out of their own pockets, the same as our opponents are required to do.

I am in favor of the cost-of-living increase proposed in this bill for the postal workers and other civil service workers. This amounts to a raise of from 2 to 5 percent.

If the pay for Members of Congress is increased by 33⅓ percent it also has a mathematical effect of increasing the retirement benefits by 6½ percent for each year for the next 5 years. This should certainly be taken into consideration when the retirement fund already is insolvent.

Certainly the proposal to raise salaries of Members of Congress should be dealt with in a separate bill rather than hooked onto this bill as a coattail rider.

In line with what the Senator from Ohio has said, there seems to be an argument as to what the congressional salaries were in prior years. In 1946 congressional salaries were $10,000, beginning in 1947 the congressional salaries were $12,500 plus $2,500 expense allowance, the latter item being tax free.

In 1953 I introduced the amendment which made that $2,500 allowance taxable. This made the whole $15,000 salary taxable.

In 1954 there was another increase of 50 percent, to $22,500.

So, mathematically, Members of Congress had a 50-percent increase in dollar income in 1947 and another 50 percent increase in 1954, and the present proposal would be a 33⅓ percent on top of that, which means that if the bill is passed Members of Congress will be receiving a 300 percent increase over and above what they were receiving in 1946. Congressional retirements are increased at an even larger percentage under these bills.

I think these facts should be dealt with and pointed out when an attempt is being made to hook an increase onto a pay bill which increases the pay of the average Federal employees from 2 to 5 percent. This proposal should be separated and made on its own merits. If it cannot be supported on its own merits it should not pass.

I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin which would strike from the bill all proposed increases for the legislative branch. If this is successful I will support the other provisions of the bill. But if they are kept tied together I shall not vote for the bill.

When Congress has balanced the budget but six times in the past 35 years I do not think we merit a raise of the proportions suggested here.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Delaware. He is correct when he says that this congressional salary increase is strictly a coattail rider. There is no question that if a congres-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

sional pay raise were proposed by itself, it might face quite a different fate than what is now proposed.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 457 Leg.]

Aiken	Hruska	Monroney
Allott	Inouye	Morse
Beall	Johnston	Morton
Bennett	Jordan, Idaho	Moss
Burdick	Keating	Mundt
Carlson	Kuchel	Nelson
Church	Lausche	Prouty
Clark	Long, La.	Proxmire
Cotton	Mansfield	Randolph
Douglas	McClellan	Scott
Fulbright	McGovern	Sparkman
Gore	McIntyre	Thurmond
Hart	McNamara	Walters
Hickenlooper	Mechem	Williams, Del.
Holland	Miller	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MUSKIE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute and ask that it be read and given immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the language contained in the pending amendment, insert the following:

"On page 114, strike out lines 17 to 24, inclusive.

"Beginning with line 5 on page 166, strike out over through line 2 on page 167 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

" 'SEC. 501. This act and the increases in compensation by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1964.' "

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to advise Senators that I intend to speak briefly. If they will remain in the Chamber, perhaps we can vote in the near future.

The amendment would merely strike from the bill the provisions permitting increases in congressional salaries. There is much logic in some of the arguments to the effect that an increase in congressional salaries is needed. I remember reading in the New York Times magazine several months ago an article by a Member of the other body who was serving his first term in Congress. Formerly he had been a professor in a university. He said, if I recall the article correctly, that his university salary, which was about half the amount of his congressional salary, enabled him to get along much more comfortably and to save more at the end of the year than he could possibly have saved as a Member of Congress. There is much merit in that argument.

Yet people throughout the country have a feeling that the salaries which we receive as Members of Congress are high enough to enable us to live luxuriously. They fail to realize and appreciate the tremendous burden of expenses which the average Member of Congress must assume in his campaigns, his entertainment of constituents, his travel, and in many other ways—expenses which no business or professional man is faced with.

Despite these things, we cannot blink the fact that we knew what the office paid when we sought it. Nor can we deny that millions of other Americans are forced to live, day by day, on the tiniest fraction of our own incomes.

The disabled worker, the unemployed family man, retired folks living on meager pensions—all of these know what it means to tighten their belts and to go without things they might like to have or which they actually need.

At present, however, the Federal budget is far out of balance. It is likely to be out of balance for some time. Should we not in such circumstances establish some list of priorities, some catalogue of claims and rights, that ought to take precedence over our own?

Let there be an increase in congressional pay, but let it come on that day when social security benefits, compensation for the disabled, and aid to the unemployed are at adequate levels of decency.

Let it come when our Federal financial house is in order and when we have taken care of first priorities first.

Many Members of the Senate and House feel that they need and can justify a pay increase; but who among us would deny that there are others who need help much more than we do?

The argument may be made that if my amendment in the nature of a substitute were adopted, it would make it possible for members of the legislative staffs to receive greater compensation than is paid to Members of Congress. However, if my amendment in the nature of a substitute is approved, I shall offer a second amendment which would make it impossible to increase staff salaries beyond $22,000. Thus, staff would not be entitled to more compensation than is being paid to Members of Congress.

That is all I wish to say. I am ready to vote at any time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment in its present form would limit all staff increases to the maximum of the salaries paid to Members of the Senate and House?

Mr. PROUTY. No; the second amendment would do that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The first amendment, however, would bar an increase for Members of the Senate and House. In other words, their salaries would remain at $22,500. It would permit the compensation of the Librarian of Congress, the Public Printer, and the Architect of the Capitol to go to $26,000; it would permit the salary of the Deputy Librarian of Congress to go to $24,500; and would permit the compensation of the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the legislative counsel of the Senate to go to $27,500?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct; but, as I have explained, I shall offer a second amendment, in case my amendment in the nature of a substitute is approved.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the amendment of the Senator from Vermont were rejected, it would mean that the entire legislative title of the bill, title 2, could be eliminated, and no increases would be provided for members of the legislative branch?

Mr. PROUTY. No, indeed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, which is a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, does not prevail, the Senate will have before it the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, which simply deletes title 2 and

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

eliminates legislative increases. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I think we are putting the cart ahead of the horse with respect to the amendment. If we adopt the Prouty amendment in the nature of a substitute, and if we then defeat the second Prouty amendment, we shall be in a rather ludicrous situation.

Furthermore, if we adopt the Prouty amendment in the nature of a substitute and then adopt the second Prouty amendment, or if we adopt the Proxmire amendment, consider the situation that will confront us.

On page 115 of the bill, provision is made for the salaries of Cabinet officers at $35,000.

On page 116, salaries of $30,000 are provided for such persons as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

On page 117, salaries of $28,500 are provided for the Deputy Postmaster General and, among others, the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Director of the Peace Corps.

Beginning on page 20, salaries of $27,000 are provided for the Deputy Administrator of General Services; six Assistant Administrators of the Agency for International Development; four Regional Assistant Administrators of the Agency for International Development; the Deputy Director of the Peace Corps; Counselor of the Department of State; Legal Adviser of the Department of State; Governor of the Farm Credit Administration; Inspector General, Foreign Assistance; members of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and many others.

I note that, beginning on page 124, salaries of $26,000 are provided for other types of Federal appointees, such as the Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture; the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency; four Deputy Administrators of the Small Business Administration; Associate Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Deputy Associate Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Chief Forester, Forest Service; Chief Postal Inspector; Chief, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce; Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission; two Associate Commissioners, Indian Claims Commission; and such other persons as Associate Director for Volunteers, Peace Corps; Associate Director for Program Development and Operations, Peace Corps.

One would think there would be a few volunteers in the Peace Corps headquarters.

Another such position is that of Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Hundreds of such people would be drawing salaries considerably higher than the salaries of Members of Congress.

This is a very unfair, unwise, and stupid move. Do not think that we shall be fooling the folks by taking such a step. I doubt whether any votes would be gained by such a move as this.

If Senators do not want to ride in on the coattails of the Post Office and Civil Service employees, the thing to do is not to provide salary increases for the judiciary and executive branch, including the hundreds of people to whom I have been referring, and for all Members of Congress. Then take up a separate bill. Let those stand on their own merits. I have not had the floor very long. Many Senator will please face it and not suggest a vote at this time because I am perfectly capable of going for a long time; but I am going to say something on this subject, because I believe there is much——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The Senator will suspend. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Chair.

I believe there is a little bit of what we might call, very politely, window dressing in the Chamber, in discussing this bill.

The Senator from Ohio pointed out a certain position for Members of Congress that has occurred in the past few years. I wish that the Senator from Ohio had given us a comparable list of increases in salaries of the various officials which I have read off, as well as the Federal judiciary.

Let us treat everyone alike, instead of singling out Members of Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Examination of the record will show that pay raises have gone on in extravagant fashion with all except the lower class of employees. The proportion of the increase may not be so great for commission members, board members, judges, and others, as it is for Senators.

Mr. MILLER. In many cases, it will be found to be about the same. I believe that the RECORD should show this.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I directed my remarks to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin because it dealt only with the legislative branch, but I believe that my remarks are just as effective against the judiciary, board members, and others.

I read in the newspaper the other day that an exhibitor of a foreign country at the New York World's Fair had to pay $150 to get a clogged sink loosened.

If we keep passing this kind of pay raise, how will we ever stop the inordinate and extravagant demands that will come in from all over the country?

If we begin to give ourselves this huge pay raise, will anyone dare to open his mouth against inflationary measures?

We recommend 3.2 percent as a general pay increase, but we are going to give ourselves 33⅓ percent over the $10,000 which we gave ourselves in 1955.

I agree with what the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said 2 hours ago: How can we do it?

This haste for a vote, this shouting to vote, seems to me to be an indication that we wish to drop the curtain as quickly as we can so that our voices will not go out to the country on what we are doing here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I find it a little difficult to understand why we are so anxious to pick on ourselves all the time, and so loath to say anything about the executive branch downtown which will get the large raise that is contemplated in this bill. They have got cars and chauffeurs.

How many Senators in the Chamber have cars and chauffeurs?

What kind of people are we?

Do we have a position of importance, or do we not?

Do we have to fight for a job, or are we appointed?

There are too many Senators who are picking on Members of their own body, finding fault with ourselves.

We are all for the "little guy." No one wishes to do anything to hurt him. But, now we have something directed against us. We are getting too much. We knew what the salary would be when we ran for office. Of course we did.

The responsibility for raising our pay, or as the Senator from West Virginia said, for lowering our pay, lies with us. We have to make that choice. We have to go back home and tell the people what we did or did not do.

I wonder what kind of people we are.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise only because of what the majority leader has just said. I should like to sustain him. I shall vote against these amendments. I shall be happy to explain it to my people.

With respect to an increase in salary, as a Senator, I have always spent more than I have received in salary. I probably always will, due to the requirements of this position.

As a Senator from New York, with the manifold accompanying duties imposed, many of which, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has listed, I have incurred substantial expenditures for research, living in Washington, and travel.

Mr. President, our job as U.S. Senators, is to earn what we receive. We should make no apology for it. We are entitled to a decent living. I have been on many boards of corporations. I was a lawyer representing substantial businesses long before I was a Senator or Representative. During those days, we would be delighted to pay $30,000 or $35,000 a year to a good branch manager of a bank, or to a vice president, or to the manager of a modern industrial plant provided that he did a good job.

The majority leader is absolutely right, we should not be apologizing. We should be determined to stand up in a refreshing way, which the American

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

people will like, and respect. We should say "yes," we are going to pass this pay bill as it was reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee because on the scale of salaries paid modern business executives, we are worth it.

I am 60 years old. I have been a successful lawyer. I have earned three times what I shall receive as a Senator at $30,000 a year. I need apologize to no one. There is no need for any other Member of this body to do likewise.

What we should resolve is that we will do a good job, and that we will do the job which is fully worthy of the pay we shall receive.

I am sure that the American people will be refreshed by the fact that we will face our responsibilities in that way.

A Senator is entitled to a decent and a dignified living.

It is impossible to earn a decent and a dignified living unless we do something about a pay adjustment in light of modern conditions.

One other point; we have a major role in the operation of the $100 billion business of the running of the Federal Government. Let no one forget that. We and the other body are the "board of directors" of that business. It is the greatest business mankind has ever conjured up.

It seems to me that we should be able to make ourselves worthy of this salary increase to the American people.

We must not compare ourselves with those earning $4,000 to $5,000 a year, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] propose, and that we reduce our pay to that level. Of course not. We demean ourselves in the eyes of the country.

We need only compare ourselves with those of commensurate responsibility.

I believe that $30,000 a year is a very fair salary—very fair. I am fully prepared to justify it to any fairminded jury of Americans in my State—or in any other State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe that the whole case is misstated in discussing congressional salaries.

We are not appropriating money or authorizing it for EVERETT DIRKSEN or for BARRY GOLDWATER or for JACK JAVITS or for WIN PROUTY. This authorizes the money that shall be paid for the office that we occupy.

If the people back home do not believe we are worth it, it will not take them very long to haul us back from Washington.

It is about time for us to recognize the fact that this authorizes pay for an office which is set up under the Constitution of the United States.

Tragically enough, this is one of the unsolved problems in the Constitution of the United States, because it provides that the remuneration of Senators and Representatives shall be ascertained by law.

What is the lawmaking body? Congress is the lawmaking body.

We have no choice. We have authority over the President's salary. We have authority to fix the salaries of judges, except that we cannot reduce them. We have authority over the salaries in Government, and we have the vexing task of fixing our own salaries.

It is about time for us to face the issue.

What is the Senate going to look like, when the House of Representatives by a majority of 87 has put this pay raise for Representatives in the bill—and if I had it to do, it would be larger—believe me. But what is going to be the comparison?

It will be said, "They have some guts in the House of Representatives, but the Senate would not stand up to it."

I had something to do with this bill twice before. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] will remember that in 1946 in the formulation of the Reorganization Act, when he was vice chairman of the committee, a pay raise and a retirement system were provided. Did we receive any backlash? Certainly we did not. I offered a resolution in 1954 to set up the Segal Committee of 18 persons.

They made their report. And then we had to discount their report. I am sorry I ever let it happen without making a protest. But timid people said, "Cut it $2,500." And I let them talk me into it, for which I am sorry. We have the same thing now. It is said, "If we cut it just a little, maybe you can take it." I did not find that the electorate took any exception to it particularly. Then we raised it. Now, I suppose, judging from the remarks of my distinguished friend from Ohio, we are far ahead of the game.

Will my friend from Iowa bear with me a few minutes?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We started in 1789, when Representatives and Senators received $6 a day when they attended a session. A farmer receives five times that much today.

In 1815, 26 years later, an annual salary of $1,500 was finally set. We had to wait 26 years to catch up. Think of it. We do not see workers doing that when collective bargaining is involved.

In 1817, the rate was placed at $8 a day.

In 1855—38 years later—there was a change in congressional salary. It then became the munificent sum of $3,000 a year.

In 1865, the last year of the war, it was placed at $5,000.

Six years later, it was set at $7,500. They never did catch up.

Then, in 1874, what was done? The rate was reduced back to $5,000.

In 1907—31 years later—the salary of Members of the House and Senate was raised. Then, it went back to $7,500.

In 1925—they had to wait 18 years for the next pay raise. The salary was set at $10,000.

So there have been only four increases since the Civil War—a period of 99 years. Just think of it. When we talk about reducing our salaries, or removing them from the bill, we demean our own bodies. I will not do it. If my people want to drag me back home, they can do so. I have defended these pay raises before. And I intend to do so again.

The Senator from Ohio raised the question about how this proposal compared with the situation of employees in Government. I have a statement from the Budget Bureau. They took as a base the postal clerks, and, taking grade 4, carried through a comparison with congressional salaries from 1935 to 1964.

That is a period of 29 years. And what was the aggregate? The employees received a total increase of 194 percent. The Representatives and Senators received a 170 percent increase. We never did catch up. And it is about time for us to catch up.

If we want to put it on a base of productivity and take 3.2 percent as a productive level from 1955 to 1964, even on that basis, our pay ought to be $31,000.

In 1935, when I was in the House, our pay was $10,000. How much income tax did we pay? $188. So, after taxes we had about $9,800 left.

The purchasing power of the dollar then was 100 percent. So we can say that out of our salary in 1935 dollars, we had a purchasing power of $9,800.

What was it in 1955? We went up to $22,500. Deductions for living expenses were $3,000. The net salary was $19,500. The income tax was—not $188—but $3,954. After taxes, what did we have left? $15,500. The purchasing power of the dollar had dropped to 51.3 percent. So, how much did we have left out of $22,500 in terms of 1935 dollars? We had $7,975 left—infinitely smaller by nearly $2,000 than we had in 1935.

In this bill, a salary of $30,000 is proposed. There would be deductions of $3,000 and a net salary of $27,000. The income tax will be—not $188—but $5,532. After taxes, what have we left out of $30,000? $21,468.

The purchasing power of the dollar as of now is 44.4 percent. The purchasing power of our salary in 1935 dollars is $9,532. We are $400 behind what we received at $10,000 in 1935.

If one questions the figures, call up the Deputy Director of the Budget, call up the Director of the Civil Service Commission. They will supply a copy of the figures.

Any way we take it, this increase for Members of Congress ought to be larger than that which is provided for in the bill. I am not going to modify it. But I hope we shall not face this issue with a degree of timidity and let the ballotbox scare anyone. JOE EVINS, of Tennessee, made a count of every House Member who voted for the House increase in salary in 1955. Not a Member who voted for it who was defeated was at the polls.

Is it not about time that we assert our own prestige and take our place in the sun of government?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We do not hear the executive branch mentioned the opponents take on their own branch. It will not pay off at all.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me tell Barkley's story and then I shall yield.

It will be remembered that when Barkley went home, an old fellow told

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

him: "I voted for you. I am not going to vote for you again." He said, "Why not?" The fellow said, "I am not going to vote for a stupid guy who voted not to increase his salary when he was entitled to it."

Now I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator might yield to me for one brief statement.

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Illinois mentioned a comparison of the situation in 1964 with that existing back in 1935. The Senator did not mention that in 1935 Congress stayed in session for 5 months on an average in the year. The Members of Congress had 7 months in which to practice law. Two-thirds of the Members of the Senate were lawyers. My father made a lot more money as a lawyer than as a Senator. As a matter of fact, as I remember it, my mother told him that he could not afford the job. He replied: "Congress is going to raise the pay." The first thing they did was to cut the pay when they got in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I remember that. I was on a couple of investigating committees, and from one end of the year to the other, I was scarcely at home. This is a 12-month job, any way we take it.

Go back home and see what happens. Constituents will make a beaten path to the offices or to the homes of Senators, or wherever they can find them, because the world is full of business which is somehow localized and centralized in this body.

Every amendment that has been offered—and there are 8 or 10 of them—ought to be voted down by the Senate, because they degrade this body. We ought to have short shrift of it and take some pride in the fact that we are attaching a paycheck to a job and not to the person who is in it. Let the people decide whether he has earned it or not. I am sorry. I thank my friend.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator need not be sorry, because he has said as eloquently as any Senator why we should vote against the pending amendment. I repeat that all we have to do is to look at the pages in the bill to which I referred and look at the hundreds of Federal employees who would be drawing more pay than a Member of the U.S. Senate if the Prouty amendment and the Proxmire amendment are adopted.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, after careful thought, I have decided to vote against the congressional pay raise. I cannot in good conscience vote to increase my salary at a time when many of my constituents are financially pinched. So I will support the amendment to eliminate the increase in congressional salaries from the bill.

It is true that the cost of living in official Washington is very high. It is true that with five children to rear and educate, I have some financial anxieties with my present income. Each year, I must reach heavily into my salary, to cover the cost of travel to and from my State. Each year, I must devote a part of my salary to postage, television films, radio tapes, and the entertainment of constituents, not covered by the office allowance.

But I cannot bring myself to vote to raise my pay, when thousands of farmers, ranchers, cattle feeders, businessmen, and working people are under as much or more financial pressure than I am. If the congressional pay raise is eliminated from the bill, I could then vote to raise the salary of other Federal workers and postal workers who are hard pressed to make ends meet. If the amendment to remove the congressional pay raise fails, however, I will vote against the entire Federal pay raise bill.

So far as I am concerned, I would rather see Congress provide adequate allowances for the operation of our offices, including travel allowance. We would not be in need of a salary increase if we did not find it necessary to devote so much of our salary to traveling back and forth to our States and to financing such costs as telephone calls, telegrams, and other costs that may run to several thousand dollars a year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] in the nature of a substitute. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], are absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay" and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea".

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 458 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Burdick	Hartke	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Robertson
Cannon	Hruska	Scott
Church	Keating	Simpson
Cooper	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	Mechem	Thurmond
Curtis	Morton	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Moss	
Fulbright	Mundt	

NAYS—60

Aiken	Hart	Metcalf
Allott	Hickenlooper	Miller
Anderson	Hill	Monroney
Bartlett	Humphrey	Morse
Beall	Inouye	Muskie
Bennett	Javits	Nelson
Bible	Johnston	Neuberger
Brewster	Jordan, N.C.	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Proxmire
Carlson	Kuchel	Randolph
Case	Long, Mo.	Russell
Clark	Long, La.	Smith
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dodd	Mansfield	Stennis
Dominick	McCarthy	Talmadge
Douglas	McClellan	Tower
Eastland	McGee	Walters
Goldwater	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	McNamara	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Bayh	Fong	Pell
Boggs	Hayden	Ribicoff
Edmondson	Jackson	Saltonstall
Engle	Kennedy	Smathers
Ervin	Pearson	Yarborough

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], for a moment, because I need a little help and clarification. There are some aspects of this bill that disturb me very much, but, at the same time, I think most of the increases are justified.

Am I correct that, so far as the civil service workers are concerned, the increase for them is at a much lower percentage—somewhere between 3 and 5 percent—as compared with the percentage of increase for Cabinet officers, judges, and others in the so-called higher pay brackets?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is true. It is higher.

Mr. MORSE. What is the difference?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The increase is about 33⅓ percent for Members of Congress and of the Cabinet. Does the Senator want the figures all the way to grade 1? The increase for that low grade is 2 or 3 percent, because those employees have received more frequent increases in the past.

Mr. MORSE. They have been receiving many increases, but the increases give those in the lower brackets an annual income of approximately how much?

Mr. JOHNSTON. For the classified employees, the grades go all the way

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

down to 1, and the increase there is very low.

Mr. MORSE. Many of them are in the salary bracket of $8,000 or $9,000, as compared with $20,000 or $30,000 in the upper brackets. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. We must act on proposed legislation as it comes off the calendar. Sometimes the order in which it is considered is not what we would prefer. It is too bad that the Senate does not have before it the legislative appropriation bill ahead of the bill it is now considering. I have listened to some very interesting debate this afternoon about problems that confront Members of Congress in regard to salaries and costs and expenses of the job.

The so-called political expenes of the job certainly should not be borne, directly or indirectly, by the taxpayers. We sought the job, and we should be expected to pay the so-called direct and indirect political expenses of the job. Yet some of the speeches this afternoon surprised me a little in that they seemed to imply that we ought to give some consideration to the fixing of salaries based on what we have to pay for so-called political expenses.

However, there is a type of expense connected with the job that is based upon a formula which is applied that works many inequities within the Senate. I refer to the allowances that are granted for so-called office expenses, using as the determining factor the population of a State as compared with others, with not too much weight given to geographical distances, nor too much weight given to the actual difference in the business done as compared with other offices.

I do not want to engage in any personal discussion other than to say, for example, that some of us who come from States with relatively small populations are greatly limited in the expense allowance to our offices, but are put to much heavier expenses than are other Senators, for a variety of reasons. I suppose such a matter is determined to a great extent by the discussion of Senators.

I shall be brief when I make this statement, but for many years on the floor of the Senate I have said that I think the taxpayers are perfectly willing to pay for the legitimate expenses of a Senator's office in transacting Senate business.

I have not kept records on this matter, except for the past 12 years.

I plow back into my desk, and have for years, the equivalent of three honorarium speeches to pay the extra cost of transacting business in connection with long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and airmail stamps, which run to $800 to $900 out of my own pocket.

I mention it now only because I hope that when the Senate considers the legislative appropriation bill this year, the Appropriations Committee will take a long look at the formula. I have insisted for years that if more money were to be allowed for the expenses of a Senate office, it should be on an accountable basis, and that accounting should be published for the benefit of the public.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I invite his attention to the fact that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is present? He happens to be chairman of the subcommittee that handles the matter the Senator from Oregon is discussing. I merely wanted to call to the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma what the Senator from Oregon is discussing.

Mr. MORSE. It is important that we take care of the actual official Senate expenses of our offices rather than put Senators in the position where they do the business but pay for it out of their own pockets. I do not think the taxpayers expect that.

I wanted to make that point in this discussion. It does not have a direct bearing on the issue before us; it has an indirect one.

I do not know why there is this reticence to allow an accounted expense allowance which actually covers the official cost of operating the office of a Senator in serving the people of a State and of the Nation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I merely wish to say that I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Oregon. He is absolutely correct. In fact, I go further and say that a Senator from Hawaii or Alaska or Washington or Oregon has an enormous travel expense. The present allowance is for only three trips home. Under those circumstances it is very unjust. The way to handle the situation is not by way of a general salary increase but, as the Senator has implied, by permitting a Senator to be compensated for all the legitimate expenses of his office.

I shall support such a proposal in any way, shape, or form with regard to telephone and telegraph expenses. I agree that the taxpayers would understand such a proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. There is some confusion between official duties and political interests. I recognize that fact. However, following the course of action that I follow in the Senate, if I did not go home at least one weekend a month, I would not have any political boards left on my fences back home. One does not go home one weekend a month free of expense.

I see my good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] smiling. That is why, through his good offices or the good offices of the Senator's assistant in Chicago, I will stop off in Chicago and make a speech, which will cover the expenses, or perhaps make a speech in San Francisco or Seattle or somewhere else.

Let us face the realities when we get to the legislative appropriation bill, and see to it that we take a good, long look at the problem.

That leads me to my next point. We should make very clear that with respect to expenditures for telephone calls and telegrams and for air mail stamps, there should be a public accounting once a year.

My next point is that in due course—not tonight—I shall offer an amendment to the bill. I have several amendments, but I shall offer one which will be the old 1946-as-revised-from-time-to-time Morse full public-disclosure bill. A Senator came to me a few minutes ago and said:

> One of the things that I like about your public disclosure bill is that it does not limit itself to Members of Congress, but covers the judiciary and the Cabinet and other officials in the high income bracket.

I shall press that amendment later. Those are factors we ought to consider in connection with the pending bill, rather than speed the bill through very quickly, as there is at present—and I say this most respectfully and noncritically—pressure in the Senate.

I am always unhappy when I cannot accommodate myself to certain proposals. Some amendments ought to be considered. I cannot accommodate myself to proposals that have been made in the past hour for a unanimous-consent agreement to fix a time, to limit debate on amendments, and to limit debate on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator from Oregon for bringing to the attention of the Senate some of the matters we have considered in committee in recommending an increase in congressional salaries.

If Senators will look at pages 116 and 117 of the bill, they will note that we brought the compensation of Members of the Senate and the House in line with those of Under Secretaries of the executive departments. They have traditionally been in that bracket. So far as additional expenses are concerned, we did not consider the expenses that the Under Secretaries have either. I do not believe that the Members of the Senate and of the House ought to be in a lower bracket than the Under Secretaries of the executive departments.

There are about 19 who have the same salaries as Members of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Iowa proposes to strike lines 2, through 6 of the Proxmire amendment No. 1084 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "through line 3 on page 166"; on page 2, line 1, change "title IV" to read "title II".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Members of the Senate, very briefly, all the amendment would do would be to transform the Proxmire amendment, which eliminates legislative salary increases into an amendment which would eliminate salary increases for the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government. It keeps intact the classified employees' salary increases.

It seems to me there ought to be a choice offered to the Senate. The choice the Proxmire amendment presently offers is really no choice at all. If we were to support the Proxmire amendment we would be singling ourselves and our staff members out for a discriminatory type program as against the executive and judicial sides of the Government.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

If my amendment is adopted, the Proxmire amendment will be before us to vote on, and we can decide whether we wish to take care of only the classified employees or whether we wish to take care of the employees of all branches of the Government.

That is the choice we would have.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, everybody would be stricken out except the voters.

Mr. MILLER. May I say to the majority leader that I have no intention of doing anything like that with my amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. MILLER. To evaluate my amendment in that fashion is very much to oversimplify the problem.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It takes in millions and leaves out a few thousand.

Mr. MILLER. That oversimplifies the point. The Proxmire amendment in its present form singles out the legislative branch. I do not think that is the choice we ought to be offering the Senate. It seems to me we ought to be given the choice of taking care of the classified employees and nobody else, or taking care of the classified employees and not singling out the legislative, judicial, and executive branch.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree in that respect. If we are to do anything with respect to Congress, we had better do it to the other branches of the Government, too.

Mr. MILLER. The majority leader now states my proposal exactly. I am happy that he gets the point.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, while the amendment can be excused on the ground that, if we are going to strike against Congress we should also strike at those employees in the executive and judicial branch of the Government who are supposed to use their brainpower to make plans in an atomic age for a future that we hope America can have, I think we would be killing the very thought behind the kind of bill President Kennedy and President Johnson, and most students of government, have urged us to pass. The crisis in the executive branch of this great Government in the atomic age, with a hundred billion dollar budget, with a burgeoning population, automation, and all the various problems that are on our doorstep, must be solved by the best minds money can obtain.

Surely; we would save some money. We would save $20 million out of a cost of $556 million, by taking this step. We would reduce the prospect of having the best people that can be found in the field to fill the jobs in the executive department. Yes, we will appeal to a lower class of people to run for Congress, because they will know it will not be possible to manage and pay expenses and put anything aside to educate their children. They will know there will be no opportunity to hold their heads up in respectability in carrying on the duties of office, as we are expected to carry them on by our constituents back home.

Four million one hundred thousand dollars is the cost of congressional pay. That is 0.7 percent of the total cost. We will pay the legislative employees and other officers $9,600,000. In this great Government of ours, with more than 2 million employees trying to supply the services, including the military and other needs, only 536 Members of Congress plus 2 other officers are elected. That is the total elective complement of our great democracy: 435 Members of the House, 100 Members of the Senate, plus the President and Vice President. The rest are all appointed.

Is it worth anything to preserve, to attract, to try to bring into the elective system men of competence? Perhaps we do not need them; but I have never found that a good salary, a salary that would help a man to pay his expenses and live in respectability, denied qualified persons the opportunity to run for office.

Why did the people support the Reorganization Act of 1946? It was because they wanted Congress to amount to something. They wanted to have competent persons working on our staffs, not retired mail carriers acting as secretaries for the Committee on Banking and Currency, or an inexperienced person from back home acting as the secretary or chief staff member of the most important committee of Congress, the Committee on Foreign Relations. No; they wanted good staffs, so they directed Congress to pay to the staffs of Members of Congress salaries equivalent to those paid in private business. That is what we did. That is why Congress has been measuring up to its responsibility in trying to meet the challenge of the new problems of today. We have been able to have just as good members of the staffs working and assisting us to pass legislation as the executive offices downtown have in administering it. Let us not downgrade our staffs.

The majority leader and the minority leader have described Congress as the people's branch of the Government. We will get what we pay for. Members of Congress must have decent salaries if they are to pay their own expenses in entertaining friends at lunch. In trying to maintain the positions we are expected to maintain as Senators, both here and at home, we must have a suitable standard of living. We try to provide for education, to maintain our libraries, to have the things we need. I think this is worth bringing the pay of Members of Congress up to parity. Parity was not set for us by a committee or by Congress or by members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of either House. It was set after a careful study and as a result of executive leadership. It has been urged upon us by both President Kennedy and President Johnson.

We have tried to establish parity with the Federal judges. Our pay will come out even with theirs at $30,000. We will have parity with the under secretaries of the departments at $30,000. If Senators will look through the bill, they will see that we have tried to establish parity of service and qualifications.

We provide a higher salary for Cabinet members; but historically Members of Congress have been linked with the pay of Federal judges, which have been less than that paid to the Cabinet.

Let us not downgrade the branch of the Government in which we serve, because millions of people throughout the world would be willing to give their right arms to have a legislative body such as ours—staffed with personnel such as that which serves the Senate and the House.

I hope the Senate will defeat the Miller amendment and the Proxmire amendment and will then move on to pass the pay bill, which has been so long in coming to us.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa would agree with much of what the Senator from Oklahoma has said, but I cannot quite understand why he made the statement he has made against the Miller amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am against the Proxmire amendment. I would be forced to say that if we adopted the Proxmire amendment, we would be doing ourselves a disservice by downgrading ourselves far below the current going rate. We have praised the value of the staffs in the executive department.

I do not choose to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, because I am against the Proxmire amendment. I favor the bill as it has been reported. It is a good bill. It will serve the country well. I think the civil service employees are entitled to a pay increase. So are the executives and other officials who have not had a raise for 10 years, while the other employees have had a 30- or 35-percent increase. The schedule works out fairly.

I shall have to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Iowa because I do not believe in cutting out the very heart of the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Why not support the Miller amendment to the Proxmire amendment and then vote against the Proxmire amendment as amended? If the Senator does not do that, he will not afford the Senate a decent choice on which to vote. If the Proxmire amendment carries, the Senator would be demeaning the legislative branch as against the executive and judicial branches. If the Senator votes for the Miller amendment, he will not have to demean himself in that way.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then I would have voted for an amendment that would destroy at least a great portion of the bill, the portion that would attract efficient, effective executives. I shall not vote for this amendment. If I am to be against the Proxmire amendment, I must also be against the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Oklahoma would have plenty of opportunity to vote against the principle he is talking about, once my amendment and the Proxmire amendment were adopted. I am trying to give the Senate a reasonably fair choice as to whether it wants to provide a general salary increase for executive, legislative, and judicial officers, along with the classified civil service, or wants to let those three groups stand by themselves in a separate bill. That is a fair choice. But under the Proxmire amendment,

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

unless it is modified by my amendment, the Senate will not have a fair choice.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should say that the Senator's amendment, if adopted, would put on record many Senators as being against an excessive pay bill. Therefore, they would be asked to vote for the Proxmire amendment, because the funds for the brainpower we are hoping to attract to the legislative and executive branches would have been stricken from the bill.

Mr. MILLER. I intend to vote for the Miller amendment as a modification of the Proxmire amendment. I think I could in clear conscience vote against the Proxmire amendment as modified.

I think the Senator from Oklahoma could vote for my amendment to give the Senate an adequate choice, and then turn around and vote against the Proxmire amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 459 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Bennett	Ellender	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Cannon	Lausche	Smathers
Church	McClellan	Talmadge
Cotton	Mechem	Thurmond
Curtis	Miller	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Mundt	Young, Ohio

NAYS—64

Aiken	Hartke	Morse
Allott	Hickenlooper	Morton
Anderson	Hill	Moss
Bartlett	Holland	Muskie
Beall	Hruska	Nelson
Bible	Humphrey	Neuberger
Brewster	Inouye	Pastore
Burdick	Javits	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Proxmire
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Case	Keating	Russell
Clark	Kuchel	Scott
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Smith
Dirksen	Long, La.	Sparkman
Dodd	Magnuson	Stennis
Douglas	Mansfield	Symington
Eastland	McGee	Tower
Fulbright	McGovern	Walters
Goldwater	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Metcalf	
Hart	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—15

Bayh	Fong	Pearson
Boggs	Hayden	Pell
Edmondson	Jackson	Ribicoff
Engle	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Ervin	McCarthy	Yarborough

So Mr. MILLER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent to attend the funeral of a relative.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 460 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Allott	Hartke	Robertson
Burdick	Holland	Simpson
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Smathers
Cannon	Keating	Stennis
Church	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	McGovern	Talmadge
Curtis	Mechem	Thurmond
Dominick	Moss	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Prouty	Young, Ohio
Gore	Proxmire	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Hart	McNamara
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Metcalf
Bartlett	Hill	Miller
Beall	Humphrey	Monroney
Bennett	Inouye	Morse
Bible	Javits	Morton
Brewster	Johnston	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Nelson
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Neuberger
Case	Kuchel	Pastore
Clark	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Cooper	Long, La.	Scott
Dirksen	Magnuson	Smith
Dodd	Mansfield	Sparkman
Eastland	McCarthy	Tower
Fulbright	McClellan	Walters
Goldwater	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	McIntyre	

NOT VOTING—15

Bayh	Fong	Pell
Boggs	Hayden	Ribicoff
Edmondson	Jackson	Russell
Engle	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Ervin	Pearson	Yarborough

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], is unavoidably detained on official business. But if he had been present he would have voted "nay" on the last amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call up my amendment. The cosponsors to the amendment are Mr. CURTIS, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. BENNETT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] proposes amendment No. 1078, reading as follows: At the appropriate place insert a new section as follows:

Nothwithstanding any other provision of this bill the effective date of any increase on any salary of $20,000 or over, shall be the first day of the first month after the close of a fiscal year with a balanced Federal budget.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no further votes tonight.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

CONFERENCE ON ROLE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the so-called Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 or war on poverty legislation is before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It will be considered next week by the full committee. I shall have some

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

amendments to the legislation at that time. In the meantime, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that at my instance, there was a conference on the role of the Federal Government in the war on poverty, called at New York University on May 11, 1964.

The conferees were headed by cochairman Dr. Miguel A. de Capriles, dean of the School of Law of New York University, and Dr. Alex Rosen, dean of the School of Social Work of New York University. The conferees included some of the most distinguished men and women in the country, men and women from great foundations, governmental agencies, and universities interested in this particular field.

Mr. President, my office has developed a digest from the stenographic transcript of the ideas and concepts which were developed there. I believe that this information from so many experts is worthy of the consideration of every Senator both now and when we finally come to consider this very important measure. As it develops in a very interesting way the lines of an editorial in the New York Times of June 24, 1964, headed "War On Poverty," I ask unanimous consent that in the body of the RECORD there may appear the digest of the conference to which I have referred, followed by the editorial from the New York Times of June 24.

There being no objection, the digest and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIGEST OF CONFERENCE ON THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN THE WAR ON POVERTY, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, MONDAY, MAY 11, 1964

CONFEREES

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS and staff, Mr. Allen Lesser.

Cochairmen of the conference: Dr. Miguel A. deCapriles, dean, School of Law, New York University; Dr. Alex Rosen, dean, School of Social Work, New York University.

Others:

George Brager, Mobilization for Youth, New York City.

Ersa H. Poston, State division for youth.

Anne M. Montero, city commission on human rights.

Benjamin H. Lyndon, dean, School of Social Welfare, State University of New York, Buffalo, N.Y.

James R. Dumpson, department of welfare, New York City.

Clark Tibbitts, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

John J. Hurley, Bureau of Family Services, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Father Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, D.J., Fordham University, Bronx, N.Y.

Henry H. Foster, Jr., professor, School of Law, New York University.

Winslow Carlton, group health insurance, New York City.

John P. Walsh, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Ben Zimmerman, mayor's commission for youth, Syracuse, N.Y.

Peter Kasius, State department of social welfare.

Willard Heckel, dean, Rutgers School of Law, New Brunswick, N.J.

Felician Foltman, New York State School of International Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Edward W. Foss, Department of Agricultural Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Marjorie Buckholz, Graduate School of Social Work, New York University, New York City.

Melvin Hermann, Mobilization for Youth, New York City.

Alexander Allen, Urban League of Greater New York, New York City.

James E. McCarthy, Mobilization for Youth, New York City.

John M. Martin, Fordham University, Bronx, N.Y.

Edward Feltelberg, office of the president of the council, New York City.

Elma L. Greenwood, National Council of Churches, New York City.

Bernard Lander, professor, Hunter College, New York City.

William F. Walsh, mayor, Syracuse, N.Y.

The conference directed its attention to three major areas of the war on poverty—youth, unemployed workers, and the aged—and their relationship to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Opening the discussion, Senator JAVITS made the points that the war on poverty should be regarded as a long-term war which requires bipartisan support, that it calls for a selective approach rarther than a one-shot omnibus attack, that it should be waged jointly with State and local governments, and that it is more than a one-man job and should be guided by a board of strategy with an executive director which would enlist the cooperation of civic and community leaders and organizations. He further emphasized that the unemployed should not be lumped with the endemic poor, and that in any comprehensive program there should be provision for close coordination with numerous existing Federal program.

I

Dr. Melvin Hermann, who heads the youth and work program of Mobilization for Youth, made a sharp distinction between youth unemployment and youth poverty, stressing that they are different problems. Among the former there are those who are unemployable, those who are employable but have no jobs, and those who are underemployed because suitable jobs for their capabilities are not available.

Reduction of the school dropout rate, though highly desirable, is no panacea for youth unemployment, Dr. Hermann said, adding that graduation from high school is no guarantee of employability. Worth exploring, however, is the possibility of extending school counseling and guidance services for youth beyond 18 or 19 and until they are placed in jobs. Related to employability is the health of youth and Dr. Hermann said that in 1 group of 100 youths under 21 in his program about 50 percent had serious medical problems. He emphatically approved continued heavy involvement of local and State agencies in Federal program of vocational education, and raised a number of questions arising from training programs in which allowances are paid, which directly affect local welfare program considerations.

Turning to title I, part A, of the Economic Opportunity Act, Dr. Hermann asked how we can recruit and train the personnel needed to man this and other projected programs in light of the present extreme shortage of professional personnel. He described as a "frightening notion" the prospect of turning young recruits over to forest rangers for training and teaching. He also asked how we could insure that youth are selected and guided into appropriate programs; who would take the responsibility of directing youth who already had experienced long periods of failure, into programs where they could succeed.

Answering a question by Dean de Capriles on the problem of providing jobs, Dr. Hermann warned that there was a danger of placing too much emphasis on motivation without assurance that jobs would be available for the youths who were being encouraged in this way. In the discussion that followed, Commissioner Dumpson added that many youth were rejected for jobs because they were Negroes or Puerto Ricans, and Winslow Carlton said that the youth's experience of failure was often reinforced by the fact that his parents had the same experience, thus making this a problem of the whole community rather than of just one individual.

Peter Kasius of the New York State Department of Social Welfare, commented on the need to involve State and local agencies intimately with the Federal programs so that there could be continuity after the Federal authorization had ended. Senator JAVITS said that the consent of the State must be obtained in any relationship between the Federal Government and local governments. Commissioner Dumpson cited the risks in this limitation and suggested that where the State refuses to act, the Federal Government then be given authority to proceed without its consent.

The discussion then touched on possibilities of rehabilitating rejected draftees and holding the draft examination at 18 years of age rather than 22 or older as at present in order to clear up health and training problems. Professor Lander cited objections to using the draft or the Department of Defense because it was not set up to become an educational institution. Both George Brager, of the Mobilization for Youth, and Dean Rosen questioned whether industry would have jobs for these young people after they had been trained. Professor Lander pointed out that in view of the development of automation, education now had the responsibility of projecting its training program for jobs of tomorrow rather than those now available. In this connection industry would have to cooperate and come up with some indication of its future needs. Dr. Hermann said schooling had to be made relevant—just to "upgrade the unemployed" was not enough; and Mrs. Anne Montero, of the city commission on human rights, suggested a national census or inventory of unfilled jobs.

II

Winslow Carlton, of Group Health Insurance, summarized the problem of poverty as it applies to the aged. He said there was practically nothing in the legislation for the older citizens, and cited the general need in this group for more income, including an increase in social security benefits and old-age assistance payments.

An income survey in 1962 for those over 65 showed a median income for nonmarried persons of $1,130 per year, and $2,875 for married couples. Families headed by a person of 65 or more made up one-third of all the families counted as poor on the basis of the 1964 annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers. In the OAA program where the range of benefits was from $34 a month in Mississippi to $111 in New York, the problem was how to increase benefits in the poorer States.

Another problem area defined by Mr. Carlton concerned workers between 50 and 65, and the difficulties they face when plant closings and other factors lead to their unemployment. Not unrelated to the general problem is the fact that many in this group have children under 18.

The relevance of a Federal program of health care insurance for the aged in this problem was also stressed by Mr. Carlton, who touched on some of its economic consequences on retired persons. Dean Benjamin H. Lyndon suggested the possibility of developing a single package of assistance incorporating all current programs of aid to the aging.

Senator JAVITS emphasized the essential role of the local community in assuring suc-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

under certain circumstances, such as when an impending election is imminent and a State's election machinery is already in progress, equitable considerations might justify a court in withholding the granting of immediately effective relief in a legislative apportionment case, even though the existing apportionment scheme was found invalid. In awarding or withholding immediate relief, a court is entitled to and should consider the proximity of a forthcoming election and the mechanics and complexities of State election laws, and should act and rely upon general equitable principles. With respect to the timing of relief, a court can reasonably endeavor to avoid a disruption of the election process which might result from requiring precipitate changes that could make unreasonably or embarrassing demands on a State in adjusting to the requirements of the court's decree."

The Court expressly approved the approach of the court in Alabama, which it commended for having correctly recognized that legislative reapportionment is primarily a matter for legislative consideration and determination, and that judicial relief becomes appropriate only when a legislature fails to reapportion according to Federal constitutional requisites in a timely fashion after having had an adequate opportunity to do so. The Court especially commended "the proper judicial restraint" shown by the Alabama court in not jumping in too quickly.

In the New York case the Court simply left it to the lower court to determine "whether, because of the imminence of (the 1964) election and in order to give the New York Legislature an opportunity to fashion a constitutionally valid legislative apportionment plan, it would be desirable to permit the 1964 election of legislators to be conducted pursuant to the existing provisions, or whether, under the circumstances, the effectuation of appellants' right to a properly weighted voice in the election of State legislators should not be delayed beyond the 1964 election."

As noted above, in the Colorado case the Court did treat the availability of initiative and referendum as a reason for which a court "might be justified in temporarily refraining from the issuance of injunctive relief in an apportionment case in order to allow for resort to an available political remedy."

In the Colorado case, the actions had been originally filed in March and July of 1962. The three-judge court gave its opinion on August 10, 1962, holding that, in view of the immediate imminence of an election, no change would be required at that time. At that same time two initiative proposals were pending to deal with apportionment. The Supreme Court held that "because of the imminence of the November 1962 election and the fact that two initiated proposals relating to legislative apportionment would be voted on by the State's electorate at that election, the district court properly stayed its hand and permitted the 1962 election of legislators to be conducted pursuant to the existing statutory scheme."

The Court thereupon remanded the matter for the district court to decide whether the constitutionally required system under its decision "can practicably be effectuated in 1964."

Conclusion as to timing: Taking the opinions as a whole, we conclude first, that our legislature must be given a fair chance to deal with this problem; and second, that in view of the imminence of the 1964 election, that fair chance comes in 1965. Finding the proper solution will take the very best thought of which the legislature is capable, and it is too soon to know what that solution will be.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We cannot possibly solve these problems prior to the 1964 election. The candidates are already in the field and we could not conceivably get a fair and sound constitutional amendment drafted and offered in time for this year. In light of all the circumstances, we recommend against proposing a special session at this time but rather recommend that we proceed affirmatively, as suggested in the two next paragraphs, as evidence of our complete good faith. Fortunately, article 21, section 1, of our constitution permits us to amend our constitution by special election; and if it appears necessary to have such an election in 1965, we can do so.

2. The present work on congressional reapportionment should be pressed to completion at full speed. At the earliest possible date, this report should be published.

3. The president of the senate, the speaker of the house, and the Governor should meet immediately to establish a procedure to prepare recommendations for a proper adjustment to the decisions in the light of the history and needs of our own State and our own people. Tentatively, we recommend a special joint commission. We can best demonstrate that we do not need to have a three-judge court do our thinking for us by doing it for ourselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed; and, without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964".

TITLE I—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY SYSTEMS

Short title

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964".

Classification Act employees

SEC. 102. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (76 Stat. 843; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,385	$3,500	$3,615	$3,730	$3,845	$3,960	$4,075	$4,190	$4,305	$4,420
GS-2	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430	4,555	4,680	4,805
GS-3	4,005	4,140	4,275	4,410	4,545	4,680	4,815	4,950	5,085	5,220
GS-4	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830
GS-5	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,155	6,320	6,485
GS-6	5,505	5,690	5,875	6,060	6,245	6,430	6,615	6,800	6,985	7,170
GS-7	6,050	6,250	6,450	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250	7,450	7,650	7,850
GS-8	6,630	6,850	7,070	7,290	7,510	7,730	7,950	8,170	8,390	8,610
GS-9	7,220	7,465	7,710	7,955	8,200	8,445	8,690	8,935	9,180	9,425
GS-10	7,900	8,170	8,440	8,710	8,980	9,250	9,520	9,790	10,060	10,330
GS-11	8,650	8,945	9,240	9,535	9,830	10,125	10,420	10,715	11,010	11,305
GS-12	10,250	10,605	10,960	11,315	11,670	12,025	12,380	12,735	13,090	13,445
GS-13	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
GS-14	14,170	14,660	15,150	15,640	16,130	16,620	17,110	17,600	18,090	18,580
GS-15	16,460	17,030	17,600	18,170	18,740	19,310	19,880	20,450	21,020	21,590
GS-16	18,935	19,590	20,245	20,900	21,555	22,210	22,865	23,520	24,175	----------
GS-17	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------",
GS-18	24,500	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to section 2(b)(4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of compensation, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the oper-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purpose of section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of the employee.

(5) If the officer or employee is in a position in grade 16 or 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to which he was promoted on or after the first day of his first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, and if he holds such position, or another position in the same grade, on the effective date of this section, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted, as of such effective date, to that rate of basic compensation to which he would have been entitled if the compensation schedule in subsection (a) of this section had been in effect on the date of his promotion.

SEC. 103. (a) Section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1131), relating to new appointments, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 801. All new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade, except that in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission which provide for such considerations as the candidate's existing salary, unusually high or unique qualifications, or a special need of the Government for his services, the head of any department may, with the approval of the Commission in each specific case, appoint individuals to positions in grade 13 and above of the General Schedule at such rate or rates above the minimum rate of the appropriate grade as the Commission may authorize for this purpose.".

(b) Section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(b)), relating to the limitation on numbers of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of such Act, is amended by inserting "(1)" after the words "in addition to", and by striking out "which may be placed in such grades" and inserting in lieu thereof ", and positions placed under this Act pursuant to section 309 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, which may be placed in such grades, and (ii) two hundred and forty examiner positions under section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 244; 5 U.S.C. 1010) which may be placed in grade 16 and nine such positions which may be placed in grade 17".

(c) Section 604(d)(3) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 944(c)(3)), is amended to read as follows:

"(3) All rates shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.".

Postal field service employees

SEC. 104. Section 1 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

" 'revenue unit' means that amount of revenue of a post office from mail and special service transactions which is equal to the average sum of postal rates and fees received by the Department during the fiscal year for 1,000 pieces of originating mail and special service transactions determined in accordance with section 2331 of this title.".

SEC. 105. Section 702 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 702. Classes of post offices

"(a) Effective at the beginning of each fiscal year the Postmaster General shall divide post offices into four classes on the basis of the revenue units of each office for the second preceding fiscal year. He shall place in the first class those post offices having 950 or more revenue units. He shall place in the second class those post offices having 190 or more revenue units, but fewer than 950 revenue units. He shall place in the third class those post offices having 36 or more revenue units, but fewer than 190 revenue units. He shall place in the fourth class those post offices having fewer than 36 revenue units.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall exclude from the revenue credited to a post office for the purposes of this section money received at that office for—

"(1) setting meters for patrons beyond the area served by the office unless authorized by the Department;

"(2) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold in large or unusual quantities to be used in mailing matter at other offices; and

"(3) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold for mailing matter diverted from other offices and mailing of matter so diverted without stamps affixed.

"(c) Whenever unusual conditions pervail at a post office of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate class based on his estimate of the number of revenue units which the office will have during the succeeding twelve months. Any office so advanced need not be relegated to a lower class before the end of the second fiscal year after the advancement. At that time, the office shall be assigned to the appropriate class in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section."

SEC. 106. Section 704 of title 39, United State Code, is amended by deleting "of the first, second, or third class" appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "(other than one for which the postmaster furnishes quarters, equipment, and fixtures on an allowance basis)",

SEC. 107. Subsection (b)(1) of section 2102 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) for post offices at which the postmaster does not furnish quarters on an allowance basis;".

SEC. 108. (a) Section 3501 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting a new subsection (c) following subsection (b) as follows:

"(c) The Postmaster General shall determine and, effective at the beginning of the first pay period in each calendar year, shall adjust the rankings of all positions for which the number of annual revenue units of a post office or its class is a relevant factor of the ranking, using the revenue units of the preceding fiscal year and the class in which the office will be placed at the beginning of the next fiscal year. The Postmaster General also may adjust rankings of such positions at other times of the year based upon substantial changes in service conditions.".

(b) Chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (c) of section 3513—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST-OFFICE CLERK. (KP-4)"; and

(B) Add the following new sentence to the end of paragraph (1): "This office has fewer than 190 revenue units annually.".

(2) In subsection (e) of section 3516—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST-MASTER. (KP-18)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $1,700" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 40 revenue units annually".

(3) In subsection (b) of section 3517—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST-MASTER. (KP-20)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $4,700" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 110 revenue units annually".

(4) In subsection (b) of section 3518—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST-MASTER. (KP-22)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $6,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 140 revenue units annually"

(5) In subsection (b) of section 3519—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-24)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $63,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,490 revenue units annually".

(6) In subsection (c) of section 3519—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST-MASTER. (KP-25)";

(B) Delete "second class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $16,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 380 revenue units annually".

(7) In subsection (b) of section 3520—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST-MASTER. (KP-27)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $63,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,490 revenue units annually".

(8) In subsection (b) of section 3521—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST-MASTER. (KP-29)";

(B) Delete "first class" appearing in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $129,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 3,060 revenue units annually".

(9) In subsection (b) of section 3522—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST-MASTER. (KP-31)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $314,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 7,450 revenue units annually".

(10) In subsection (b) of section 3523—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST-MASTER. (KP-33)";

(B) Delete "first class" appearing in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof: "This office has approximately 110 employees, approximately 14,350 revenue units annually, 13 government-owned vehicle units, one classified station and 42 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.".

(11) In subsection (b) of section 3524—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER (KP-35)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $2,700,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 64,000 revenue units annually".

(12) In subsection (c) of section 3524—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST-MASTER. (KP-36)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $1,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 23,700 revenue units annually".

(13) In subsection (a) of section 3525—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-37)"; and

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $8,460,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 200,000 revenue units annually".

(14) In subsection (b) of section 3525—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–38)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $2,700,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 64,000 revenue units annually".

(15) In subsection (a) of section 3526—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–39)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $16,900,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 400,000 revenue units annually".

(16) In subsection (b) of section 3526—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–40)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $4,470,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 106,000 revenue units annually".

(17) In subsection (b) of section 3527—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–42)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $48,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,000,000 revenue units annually".

(18) In subsection (c) of section 3527—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–43)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $8,460,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 200,000 revenue units annually".

(19) In subsection (b) of section 3528—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–45)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $140,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 2,500,000 revenue units annually".

(20) In subsection (c) of section 3528—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–46)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $16,900,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 400,000 revenue units annually".

(21) In section 3529—

(A) Change the catchline immediately preceding paragraph (1) to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–47)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $48,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,000,000 revenue units annually".

(22) In section 3530—

(A) Change the catchline immediately preceding paragraph (1) to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–48)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $140,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 2,500,000 revenue units annually".

SEC. 109. Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows—

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

"POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

"PFS	"Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$3,945	$4,075	$4,205	$4,335	$4,465	$4,595	$4,725	$4,855	$4,985	$5,115	$5,245	$5,375
2	4,270	4,410	4,550	4,690	4,830	4,970	5,110	5,250	5,390	5,530	5,670	5,810
3	4,615	4,770	4,925	5,080	5,235	5,390	5,545	5,700	5,855	6,010	6,165	6,320
4	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,155	6,320	6,485	6,650	6,815
5	5,345	5,525	5,705	5,885	6,065	6,245	6,425	6,605	6,785	6,965	7,145	7,325
6	5,735	5,925	6,115	6,305	6,495	6,685	6,875	7,065	7,255	7,445	7,635	7,825
7	6,140	6,345	6,550	6,755	6,960	7,165	7,370	7,575	7,780	7,985	8,190	
8	6,650	6,870	7,090	7,310	7,530	7,750	7,970	8,190	8,410	8,630		
9	7,190	7,430	7,670	7,910	8,150	8,390	8,630	8,870	9,110	9,350		
10	7,830	8,095	8,360	8,625	8,890	9,155	9,420	9,685	9,950	10,215		
11	8,650	8,945	9,240	9,535	9,830	10,125	10,420	10,715	11,010	11,305		
12	9,570	9,895	10,220	10,545	10,870	11,195	11,520	11,845	12,170	12,495		
13	10,575	10,940	11,305	11,670	12,035	12,400	12,765	13,130	13,495	13,860		
14	11,660	12,065	12,470	12,875	13,280	13,685	14,090	14,495	14,900	15,305		
15	12,885	13,330	13,775	14,220	14,665	15,110	15,555	16,000	16,445	16,890		
16	14,240	14,735	15,230	15,725	16,220	16,715	17,210	17,705	18,200	18,695		
17	15,755	16,305	16,855	17,405	17,955	18,505	19,055	19,605	20,155	20,705		
18	17,450	18,060	18,670	19,280	19,890	20,500	21,110	21,720	22,330	22,940		
19	19,345	20,020	20,695	21,370	22,045	22,720	23,395	24,070				
20	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445							

SEC. 110. Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows—

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'RCS'.

"RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

	"Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carriers in rural delivery service:												
Fixed compensation per annum	$2,240	$2,345	$2,450	$2,555	$2,660	$2,765	$2,870	$2,975	$3,080	$3,185	$3,290	$3,395
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25".

SEC. 111. (a) Section 3544 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3544. Fourth Class Office Schedule

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'FOS', for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based on the revenue units of the post office for the preceding fiscal year. Basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

"FOURTH-CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

"Revenue units	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but less than 36	$3,769	$3,894	$4,019	$4,144	$4,269	$4,394	$4,519	$4,644	$4,769	$4,894	$5,019	$5,144
24 but less than 30	3,485	3,600	3,715	3,830	3,945	4,060	4,175	4,290	4,405	4,520	4,635	4,750
18 but less than 24	2,877	2,974	3,071	3,168	3,265	3,362	3,459	3,556	3,653	3,750	3,847	3,944
12 but less than 18	2,258	2,331	2,404	2,477	2,550	2,623	2,696	2,769	2,842	2,915	2,988	3,061
6 but less than 12	1,628	1,680	1,732	1,784	1,836	1,888	1,940	1,992	2,044	2,096	2,148	2,200
Less than 6	1,313	1,355	1,397	1,439	1,481	1,523	1,565	1,607	1,649	1,691	1,733	1,775".

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"(b) The basic salary of postmasters in fourth-class post offices shall be readjusted for changes in revenue units at the start of the first pay period after January 1 of each year. When a post office is restored to a revenue unit category held by it prior to relegation to a lower revenue unit category, the postmaster's basic salary may be adjusted to the highest salary step held by him when the post office was in the higher revenue unit category. In all other cases, in adjusting a postmaster's basic salary under this section, the basic salary shall be fixed at the lowest step which is higher than the basic salary received by the postmaster at the end of the preceding fiscal year. If there is no such step the basic salary shall be fixed at the highest step for the adjusted revenue units of the office. Each increase in basic salary because of change in revenue units shall be deemed the equivalent of a step increase under section 3552 of this title and the waiting period, for purposes of advancement to the next step, shall begin on the date of adjustment.

"(c) The basic salaries of postmasters at newly established offices of the fourth class shall be fixed at the lowest salary rate. Whenever unusual conditions prevail at any post office of the fourth class the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate category based on his estimate of the number of revenue units which the office will have during the succeeding twelve months. Any fourth-class office advanced to the appropriate category pursuant to this subsection shall not be reduced in category until the start of the first pay period after January 1 of the calendar year following the calendar year in which it was so advanced, at which time it shall be assigned to the category indicated by the revenue units for the preceding fiscal year.

"(d) Persons who perform the duties of postmaster at post offices of the fourth class where there is a vacancy or during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave, or leave without pay, shall be paid the same basic salary to which they would have been entitled if regularly appointed as postmaster.

"(e) The Postmaster General may allow to postmasters in fourth-class post offices additional compensation for separating services and for unusual conditions during a portion of the year, in lieu of an allowance for clerical services for this purpose.

"(f) At seasonal post offices of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may authorize the payment of the basic salary prorated over the pay periods the office is open for business during the fiscal year.

"(g) Where the revenue units of a post office of the third class for each of two consecutive fiscal years are less than 36, or where in any fiscal year the revenue units are less than 33, the post office shall be relegated to the fourth class and the basic salary of the postmaster shall be fixed in the manner provided in subsection (b) of this section.

"(h) When required by the Postmaster General a postmaster at a fourth-class office shall, and any other postmaster in PFS level 5 when permitted by the Postmaster General may, furnish quarters, fixtures, and equipment for an office on an allowance basis. The allowance for this purpose shall be an amount equal to 15 per centum of the basic compensation for the postmaster at the office."

SEC. 112. (a) Subsection (a) of section 6007 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Postmaster General shall pay to persons, other than special delivery messengers at post offices of the first class, for making delivery of special delivery mail such fees as may be established by him not in excess of the special delivery fee.".

(b) Section 2009 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting "at any price less than eight cents per piece" and inserting in lieu thereof "at any price less than the fees established pursuant to section 6007(a) of this title.".

SEC. 113. Section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "gross receipts" in subsection (a)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof "revenue unit"; and

(2) by striking out "gross receipts" in subsection (f)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "revenue unit".

SEC. 114. (a) Section 3552(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) Each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, each employee subject to the Rural Carrier Schedule, and each employee subject to the Fourth Class Office Schedule who has not reached the highest step for his position shall be advanced successively to the next higher step as follows:

"(A) to steps 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of fifty-two calendar weeks of satisfactory service; and

"(B) to steps 8 and above—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of satisfactory service.

"(2) The receipt of an equivalent increase during any of the waiting periods specified in this subsection shall cause a new full waiting period to commence for further step increases."

(b) Section 3552 of title 39, United States Code, is further amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, the Postmaster General is authorized to advance any employee in PFS level 9 or below who—

"(1) was promoted to a higher level between July 9, 1960, and October 13, 1962; and

"(2) is senior with respect to total postal service to an employee in his own post office promoted to the same position since October 13, 1962, and is at a step in the level below the step of the junior employees.

Any increase under the provisions of this subsection shall not constitute an equivalent increase and credit earned prior to adjustment under this subsection for advancement to the next step shall be retained."

SEC. 115. (a) Section 711 of title 39, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The table of contents of chapter 7 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting

"711. Method of determining gross receipts.".

SEC. 116. The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth Class Office Schedule, immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels, receipts categories, or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion

(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this section, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

Employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration

SEC. 117. (a) Section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the appointment and annual salaries of certain staff positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director

"(a) The Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the following—

"(1) The Chief Medical Director, who shall be the Chief of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and shall be directly responsible to the Administrator for the operations of the Department. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Deputy Chief Medical Director, who shall be the principal assistant of the Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

"(3) Not to exceed five Assistant Chief Medical Directors, who shall be appointed by the Administrator upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director. One Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine who shall be directly responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Dental Service.

"(4) Such Medical Directors as may be appointed by the Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, to suit the needs of the Department. A Medical Director shall be either a qualified doctor of medicine or a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine.

"(5) A Director of Nursing Service, who shall be a qualified registered nurse, appointed by the Administrator, and who shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Nursing Service.

"(6) A Chief Pharmacist and a Chief Dietitian, appointed by the Administrator.

"(7) Such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by this chapter.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any appointment under this section shall be for a period of four years, with reappointment permissible for successive like periods, except that persons so appointed or reappointed shall be subject to removal by the Administrator for cause.

"(c) The Administrator may designate a member of the Chaplain Service of the Veterans' Administration as Director, Chaplain Service, for a period of two years, subject to removal by the Administrator for cause. Redesignation under this subsection may be made for successive like periods. An individual designated as Director, Chaplain Service, shall at the end of his period of service as Director revert to the position, grade, and status which he held immediately prior to being designated Director, Chaplain Service, and all service as Director, Chaplain Service, shall be creditable as service in the former position.".

(b) The table of contents of chapter "3 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"4103. Appointments and compensations."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director.".

(c) Section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), shall not apply to any individual appointed, before January 1, 1964, as Chief Medical Director under section 4103 of title 38, United States Code; but section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a), shall apply, in accordance with its terms, to any such individual.

SEC. 118. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"SECTION 4103 SCHEDULE

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, $24,500.

"Medical Director, $21,445 minimum to $24,445 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Director, Chaplain Service, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"PHYSICIAN AND DENTIST SCHEDULE

"Director grade, $18,935 minimum to $24,175 maximum.

"Executive grade, $17,655 minimum to $23,190 maximum.

"Chief grade, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Senior grade, $14,170 minimum to $18,580 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $12,075 minimum to $15,855 maximum.

"Full grade, $10,250 minimum to $13,445 maximum.

"Associate grade, $8,650 minimum to $11,305 maximum.

"NURSE SCHEDULE

"Assistant Director grade, $14,170 minimum to $18,580 maximum.

"Chief grade, $12,075 minimum to $15,855 maximum.

"Senior grade, $10,250 minimum to $13,445 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $8,650 minimum to $11,305 maximum.

"Full grade, $7,220 minimum to $9,425 maximum.

"Associate grade, $6,315 minimum to $8,205 maximum.

"Junior grade, $5,505 minimum to $7,170 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position.".

Foreign Service officers; staff officers and employees

SEC. 119. Section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows:

"FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

"SEC. 412. There shall be ten classes of Foreign Service officers, including the classes of career ambassador and of career minister. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be at the rate provided by law for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be at the rate provided by law for level V of such schedule. The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$22,650	$23,440	$24,500				
Class 2	18,295	18,930	19,565	$20,200	$20,835	$21,470	$22,105
Class 3	14,860	15,375	15,890	16,405	16,920	17,435	17,950
Class 4	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595
Class 5	9,945	10,290	10,635	10,980	11,325	11,670	12,015
Class 6	8,295	8,580	8,865	9,150	9,435	9,720	10,005
Class 7	7,010	7,245	7,480	7,715	7,950	8,185	8,420
Class 8	6,050	6,250	6,450	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250".

SEC. 120. Subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There shall be ten classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees. The per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$14,860	$15,375	$15,890	$16,405	$16,920	$17,435	$17,950	$18,465	$18,980	$19,495
Class 2	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
Class 3	9,945	10,290	10,635	10,980	11,325	11,670	12,015	12,360	12,705	13,050
Class 4	8,295	8,580	8,865	9,150	9,435	9,720	10,005	10,290	10,575	10,860
Class 5	7,480	7,735	7,990	8,245	8,500	8,755	9,010	9,265	9,520	9,775
Class 6	6,755	6,980	7,205	7,430	7,655	7,880	8,105	8,330	8,555	8,780
Class 7	6,205	6,410	6,615	6,820	7,025	7,230	7,435	7,640	7,845	8,050
Class 8	5,490	5,675	5,860	6,045	6,230	6,415	6,600	6,785	6,970	7,155
Class 9	5,010	5,175	5,340	5,505	5,670	5,835	6,000	6,165	6,330	6,495
Class 10	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830".

SEC. 121. Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

Agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees

SEC. 122. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102 of this Act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 123. Section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 1173) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The rate of basic compensation, established under this section, and received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of a statutory increase in the compensation schedules of the salary systems specified in subsection (a) shall be initially adjusted on the effective date of such new compensation schedules in accordance with conversion rules and regulations prescribed by the President or by such agency or agencies as he may designate."

SEC. 124. Subsection (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838; 3 U.S.C. note fol. 102), is amended by striking out "$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$65,000".

Absorption of costs

SEC. 125. (a) The cost of not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate amount of the increases in compensation provided by this title for the fiscal year 1965 shall be absorbed by the departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch; and no amount beyond the additional sum for such compensation increases proposed in the budget for the fiscal year 1965 is authorized to be appropriated by any provision of this Act. The total amount of such absorption shall be allocated by the Bureau of the Budget among such departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in such manner and to such extent as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget deems appropriate in the light of their essential functions.

(b) Pursuant to the objective of this section, heads of the executive branch activities concerned are directed to review with meticulous care each vacancy resulting from voluntary resignation, retirement, or death and to determine whether the duties of the position can be reassigned to other employees or whether the position can be abolished without seriously affecting the execution of essential functions.

(c) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be held or considered to require (1) the separation from the service of any individual by reduction in force or other personnel action or (2) the placing of any individual in a leave-without-pay status.

TITLE II—FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE SALARIES

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1964".

SEC. 202. (a) Each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation in an amount equal to the greater of the following amounts, as applicable:

(1) an amount equal to 3½ per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law) in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section plus 1 per centum of such gross rate for each whole multiple, or part of a multiple, of $500 basic compensation; or

(2) an amount equal to 5 per centum of such gross rate.

(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this title, shall be increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase provided by subsection (a) of this section in that gross rate which is nearest in amount to the total annual compensation of such officer or employee.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

(c) Each of the limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives shall be increased by 7 per centum. The amount of each increase under this subsection shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

(e) Section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(e)), is amended—

(1) by striking out "$8,880" where it first appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,"; and

(2) by striking out "$8,880" at the second place where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(f)(1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

(2) Clause 28(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

(A) by striking out "$8,880" where it first appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,"; and

(B) by striking out "$8,880" at the second place where it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

(g) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on the effective date prescribed by section 501(a), to the lowest multiple of $60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act, the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

(h) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (i), the rates of gross compensation of the Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, the Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase which would be provided by subsection (a) of this section in that gross rate determined without regard to the provisions referred to in subsection (i) of this section which is nearest in amount to the total annual compensation of such officer or employee.

(i) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading "SENATE" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86-568), is amended by striking out "$18,880" and inserting in lieu thereof "$22,945".

(j) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 7 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

(k) The gross rate of compensation of the Postmaster of the Senate shall be $18,420, and the gross rate of compensation of the Assistant Postmaster of the Senate shall be $14,570. The provisions of section 106 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1963, shall not hereafter apply to employees referred to in this subsection.

SEC. 203. (a) The compensation of the Comptroller General of the United States shall be at the rate of $30,000 per annum.

(b) The compensation of the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States shall be at the rate of $28,000 per annum.

(c) The compensation of the General Counsel of the United States General Accounting Office, the Librarian of Congress, the Public Printer, and the Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $26,000 per annum.

(d) The compensation of the Deputy Librarian of Congress, the Deputy Public Printer, and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $24,500 per annum.

(e) The compensation of the Second Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

(f) The compensation of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $12,500 per annum.

(g) The compensation of the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and the Legislative Counsel of the Senate shall be at the rate of $27,500 per annum.

(h) The compensation of the Chaplain of the Senate shall be at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

SEC. 204. Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 31), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $30,000 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $43,000 per annum."

SEC. 205. No officer or employee subject to section 202(a) or 202(b) of this title shall receive, by reason of any provision of this title, an increase in gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law), or in total annual compensation, which is in excess of the amount of the increase in basic compensation provided by the amendment made by section 102(a) of title I of this Act for positions in grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

TITLE III—FEDERAL EXECUTIVE SALARIES

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964".

SEC. 302. There is hereby established for offices and positions to which section 303 of this title applies a basic compensation schedule, to be known as the "Federal Executive Salary Schedule", which shall be divided into five salary levels.

SEC. 303. (a) Level I of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $35,000:

(1) Secretary of State.
(2) Secretary of the Treasury.
(3) Secretary of Defense.
(4) Attorney General.
(5) Postmaster General.
(6) Secretary of the Interior.
(7) Secretary of Agriculture.
(8) Secretary of Commerce.
(9) Secretary of Labor.
(10) Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) Level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $30,000:

(1) Deputy Secretary of Defense.
(2) Under Secretary of State.
(3) Administrator, Agency for International Development.
(4) Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
(5) Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
(6) Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.
(7) Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.
(8) Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.
(9) Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.
(10) Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
(11) Director of the Bureau of the Budget.
(12) Director of the Office of Science and Technology.
(13) Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
(14) Director of the United States Information Agency.
(15) Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent: *Provided*, That thereafter the position shall be placed in level III.
(16) Director of Central Intelligence.
(17) Secretary of the Air Force.
(18) Secretary of the Army.
(19) Secretary of the Navy.

(c) Level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $28,500:

(1) Deputy Attorney General.
(2) Solicitor General of the United States.
(3) Deputy Postmaster General.
(4) Under Secretary of Agriculture.
(5) Under Secretary of Commerce.
(6) Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.
(7) Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.
(8) Under Secretary of the Interior.
(9) Under Secretary of Labor.
(10) Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs or Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.
(11) Under Secretary of the Treasury.
(12) Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.
(13 Administrator of General Services.
(14) Administrator of the Small Business Administration.
(15) Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
(16) Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development.
(17) Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.
(18) Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission.
(19) Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.
(20 Chairman, Board of Directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
(21) Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
(22) Chairman, Federal Power Commission.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

(23) Chairman, Federal Trade Commission.
(24) Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission.
(25) Chairman, National Labor Relations Board.
(26) Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.
(27) Chairman, Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.
(28) Comptroller of the Currency.
(29) Commissioner of Internal Revenue.
(30) Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense.
(31) Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
(32) Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.
(33) Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.
(34) Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.
(35) Director of the Peace Corps.
(36) Director of Selective Service, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent: *Provided*, That thereafter the position shall be placed in Level IV.
(37) Chief Medical Director in the Departmetn of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.
(38) Director of the National Science Foundation.
(39) Deputy Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.
(40) President, Export-Import Bank of Washington.

(d) Level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $27,000:
(1) Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State.
(2) Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.
(3) Deputy Administrator of General Services.
(4) Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
(5) Assistant Administrators, Agency for International Development (6).
(6) Regional Assistant Administrators, Agency for International Development (4).
(7) Under Secretary of the Department of the Air Force.
(8) Under Secretary of the Department of the Army.
(9) Under Secretary of the Department of the Navy.
(10) Deputy Under Secretaries of State (2).
(11) Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture (3).
(12) Assistant Secretaries of Commerce (4).
(13) Assistant Secretaries of Defense (7).
(14) Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force (3).
(15) Assistant Secretaries of the Army (3).
(16) Assistant Secretaries of the Navy (3).
(17) Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare (2).
(18) Assistant Secretaries of the Interior (4).
(19) Assistant Attorneys General (9).
(20) Assistant Secretaries of Labor (4).
(21) Assistant Postmasters General (5).
(22) Assistant Secretaries of State (11).
(23) Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury (4).
(24) Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission.
(25) Chairman of the National Mediation Board.
(26) Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board.
(27) Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission.
(28) Commissioner, Community Facilities Administration.
(29) Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration.
(30) Commissioner, Public Housing Administration.
(31) Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration.
(32) Director of Civil Defense.
(33) Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.
(34) Deputy Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.
(35) Deputy Director, Office of Emergency Planning.
(36) Deputy Director, Office of Science and Technology.
(37) Deputy Director of the Peace Corps.
(38) Deputy Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
(39) Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency.
(40) Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.
(41) Assistant Directors of the Bureau of the Budget (3).
(42) General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.
(43) General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.
(44) General Counsel of the Department of Defense.
(45) General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
(46) Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.
(47) Solicitor of the Department of Labor.
(48) General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.
(49) General Counsel of the Post Office Department.
(50) Counselor of the Department of State.
(51) Legal Adviser of the Department of State.
(52) General Counsel of the Department of the Treasury.
(53) First Vice President, Export-Import Bank of Washington.
(54) General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission.
(55) Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.
(56) Inspector General, Foreign Assistance.
(57) Members, Atomic Energy Commission.
(58) Members, Civil Aeronautics Board.
(59) Members, Council of Economic Advisers.
(60) Members, Export-Import Bank of Washington.
(61) Members, Federal Communications Commission.
(62) Members, Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
(63) Members, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
(64) Members, Federal Power Commission.
(65) Members, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
(66) Members, Federal Trade Commission.
(67) Members, Interstate Commerce Commission.
(68) Members, National Labor Relations Board.
(69) Members, Securities and Exchange Commission.
(70) Members, Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.
(71) Members, United States Civil Service Commission.

(e) Level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $26,000:
(1) Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture.
(2) Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture.
(3) Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.
(4) Administrator, Farmers Home Administration.
(5) Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture.
(6) Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture.
(7) Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.
(8) Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior.
(9) Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.
(10) Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.
(11) Deputy Administrators of the Small Business Administration (four).
(12) Associate Administrator for Administration, Federal Aviation Agency.
(13) Associate Administrator for Development, Federal Aviation Agency.
(14) Associate Administrator for Program, Federal Aviation Agency.
(15) Associate Administrator for Advanced Research and Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
(16) Associate Administrator for Space Science and Applications, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
(17) Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
(18) Associate Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
(19) Deputy Associate Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
(20) Associate Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
(21) Archivist of the United States.
(22) Area Redevelopment Administrator, Department of Commerce.
(23) Assistant Secretary of Administration, Department of Agriculture.
(24) Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
(25) Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Interior.
(26) Assistant Attorney General for Administration.
(27) Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Labor.
(28) Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of the Treasury.
(29) Assistant General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission.
(30) Assistant and Scientific Adviser to the Secretary of the Interior.
(31) Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.
(32) Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense.
(33) Chairman of the Renegotiation Board.
(34) Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board.
(35) Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury.
(36) Chief Forester, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.
(37) Chief Postal Inspector, Post Office Department.
(38) Chief, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce.
(39) Commissioner of Customs, Department of the Treasury.
(40) Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration.
(41) Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
(42) Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.
(43) Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
(44) Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

(45) Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.
(46) Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission.
(47) Associate Commissioners, Indian Claims Commission (2).
(48) Commissioner of Patents, Department of Commerce.
(49) Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration.
(50) Commissioner of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.
(51) Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
(52) Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
(53) Commissioner of Welfare, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
(54) Director, Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense.
(55) Director of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture.
(56) Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce.
(57) Director, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.
(58) Director, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.
(59) Director, Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.
(60) Director, Office of Research and Engineering, Post Office Department.
(61) Director, National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.
(62) Director of Regulation, Atomic Energy Commission.
(63) Director of Science and Education, Department of Agriculture.
(64) Deputy Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, Department of the Treausry.
(65) Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury.
(66) Deputy Director, National Science Foundation.
(67) Deputy Director, Policy and Plans, United States Information Agency.
(68) Deputy General Counsel, Department of Defense.
(69) Deputy General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission.
(70) Associate Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.
(71) Associate Director for Volunteers, Peace Corps.
(72) Associate Director for Program Development and Operations, Peace Corps.
(73) Assistants to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice (2).
(74) Assistant Directors, Office of Emergency Planning (3).
(75) Assistant Directors, United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (4).
(76) Federal Highway Administrator, Department of Commerce.
(77) Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.
(78) General Counsel of the Agency for International Development.
(79) General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force.
(80) General Counsel of the Department of the Army.
(81) General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission.
(82) General Counsel of the Federal Aviation Agency.
(83) General Counsel of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.
(84) General Counsel of the Department of the Navy.
(85) General Counsel of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
(86) Governor of the Canal Zone.
(87) Manpower Administrator, Department of Labor.
(88) Maritime Administrator, Department of Commerce.
(89) Members, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.
(90) Members, Maritime Commission.
(91) Members, National Mediation Board.
(92) Members, Railroad Retirement Board.
(93) Members, Renegotiation Board.
(94) Members, Subversive Activities Control Board.
(95) Members, United States Tariff Commission.
(96) President of the Federal National Mortgage Association.
(97) Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(f) In addition to the offices and positions listed in subsections (d) and (e) of this section, the President is authorized from time to time to place offices and positions held by not to exceed twenty persons in levels IV and V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule when he deems such action necessary to reflect changes in organization, management responsibilities, or workload in any Federal department or agency. Any such action with respect to an office to which appointment is made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall be effective only at the time of a new appointment to such office. Each action taken under this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register, except when it is determined by the President that such publication would be contrary to the interest of the national security. No action shall be taken under this subsection with respect to an office or position the compensation for which is fixed at a specific rate by this title or by statute enacted subsequent to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. (a) Section 104 of title 3, United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President), is amended by striking out "$35,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$43,000".

(b) Section 105 of title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 105. Compensation of secretaries and executive, administrative, and staff assistants to President

"The President is authorized to fix the compensation of the six administrative assistants authorized to be appointed under section 106 of this title, of the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, of the Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, and of eight other secretaries or immediate staff assistants in the White House Office at rates of basic compensation not to exceed that of level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.".

Conforming changes in existing law

SEC. 305. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) The Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2201–2209), establishing rates of basic compensation for heads of executive departments and other Federal officials.

(2) Section 3012(h) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Army.

(3) Section 3013(b) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the annual salaries of the Under Secretary and each Assistant Secretary of the Army at $20,000 a year.

(4) Section 5031(d) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Navy.

(5) Section 5033(c) of title 10, United States Code, providing the annual salary of $20,000 a year for the Under Secretary of the Navy.

(6) Section 304 of Public Law 87-651, approved September 7, 1962 (76 Stat. 526; 10 U.S.C. 5034, note), providing compensation of $20,000 a year for Assistant Secretaries of the Navy.

(7) Section 8012(g) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Air Force.

(8) Section 8013(b) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the annual salaries of the Under Secretary and each Assistant Secretary of the Air Force at $20,000 a year.

(9) Section 137(c) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the compensation of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense at the rate prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments.

(10)(A) The last sentence of section 22 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 924; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2032(a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of such Commission, which reads: "Each member, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 per annum; and the member designated as Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.".

(B) That part of the first sentence of sectioon 27 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2037(a)), relating to the salary of the Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for an Assistant Secretary of Defense".

(11) That part of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1958 (72 Stat. 1799 and 861; 75 Stat. 630; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note)—

(A) In section 2(b), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments";

(B) In section 2(c), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Director of such Office, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the under secretaries referred to in section 104 of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 (5 U.S.C. 2203),"; and

(C) In section 2(d) relating to the annual salaries of three Assistant Directors of such Office, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments."

(12)(A) That part of the second sentence of section 202(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2472(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 202(b) of such Act (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2472(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Administration, which reads: ", shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,500 per annum".

(13)(A) That part of section 201(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)), relating to the annual salary of a civilian executive secretary in the National Aeronautics and Space Council, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 a year".

(B) That part of section 204 of such Act (72 Stat. 431, 432; 42 U.S.C. 2474(a)(1), and (d)), relating to the annual salary of the Chairman of the Civilian-Military Liaison Committee, as follows:

In subsection (a)(1), that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation (in the manner provided in subsection (d)) at the rate of $20,000 per annum".

In the second sentence of subsection (d), that part which reads: "fixed by subsection (a)(1)".

(14)(A) That part of the second sentence of section 2(a) of the Act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U.S.C. 151b(a)) as amended, relating to the rank and salary of the Counselor and of the Legal Adviser of the Depart-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ment of State, which reads: "and shall receive the same salary as".

(B) The last sentence of section 2(a) of the Act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U.S.C. 151b(a)) as amended, relating to the rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Under Secretaries of State, which reads: "Unless otherwise provided for by law, the rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Under Secretaries of State shall be the same as that of Assistant Secretaries of State.".

(C) That part of the second sentence of section 2(b) of the Act of May 26, 1949, as amended (73 Stat. 265; 5 U.S.C. 151b(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs or for Economic Affairs, as designated by the President, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 a year and".

(15) The last sentence of section 210(a) of title 38, United States Code, relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, which reads: "He shall receive a salary of $21,000 a year, payable monthly.".

(16)(A) The last sentence of section 201(a)(2) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 741; 49 U.S.C. 1321(a)(2)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which reads: "Each member of the Board shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum, except that the member serving as Chairman shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,500 per annum.".

(B) That part of the second sentence of section 301(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 744; 49 U.S.C. 1341(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum".

(C) That part of the second sentence of section 302(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 744; 49 U.S.C. 1342(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Agency, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum, and".

(17)(A) The last sentence of section 22 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2562), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which reads: "He shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.".

(B) The second sentence of section 23 of such Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2563), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Director of such Agency, which reads: "He shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,500 per annum.".

(C) The second sentence of section 24 of such Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2564), relating to the annual salaries of the four Assistant Directors of such Agency, which reads: "They shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum.".

(18) Section 3 of the Act of March 2, 1955 (69 Stat. 10; 5 U.S.C. 294, 293, 295a), relating to the annual salaries of certain officials of the Department of Justice, which reads:

"SEC. 3. (a) The compensation of the Deputy Attorney General shall be at the rate of $21,000 per annum.

"(b) The compensation of the Solicitor General shall be at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

"(c) The compensation of each Assistant Attorney General, other than the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum.".

(19)(A) The last sentence of section 102(c) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 7 of 1961 (75 Stat. 840; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of the Federal Maritime Commission, which reads: "The Chairman of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,500 per annum, and each of the other Commissioners shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum.".

(B) That part of section 201 of such reorganization plan (75 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the annual salary of the Maritime Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum,".

(20) That part of the fourth sentence of section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (74 Stat. 408 and 913; 15 U.S.C. 78d(a)); relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and Commissioners of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which reads: "shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 a year, except that the Chairman shall receive additional salary at the rate of $500 a year and".

(21) Section 8 of the Food Additives Amendments of 1958 (72 Stat. 1789; 5 U.S.C. 2205, note), fixing the annual salary of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs at $20,000 per annum.

(22) That part of the first sentence of section 3 of the Area Redevelopment Act (75 Stat. 48; 42 U.S.C. 2502), relating to the annual salary of the Area Redevelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce".

(23) The last sentence of section 203(b)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (72 Stat. 520; 5 U.S.C. 171c(b)(1)), relating to the annual salary of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, which reads: "The compensation of the Director is that prescribed by law for the Secretaries of the military departments.".

(24) In section 303(a) of title 23, United States Code,

(A) That part of the second sentence, relating to the annual salary of the Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "shall receive basic compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments and"; and

(B) The last sentence, relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Federal Highway Administrator in such department, which reads: "The Deputy Federal Highway Administrator shall receive basic compensation at a rate $1,000 less than the rate provided for the Federal Highway Administrator.".

(25) The last proviso in the paragraph under the heading "IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE" and under the subheading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 251; 5 U.S.C. 2206, note), relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which reads: ": *Provided further*, That, hereafter, the compensation of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be $20,000 per annum".

(26) The second paragraph of section 3 of title 35, United States Code, relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of Patents which reads: "The annual rate of compensation of the Commissioner shall be $20,000.".

(27) That part of section 4(a) of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612; 22 U.S.C. 2503(a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Director and of the Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, which reads: ", whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $20,000 per annum," and ", whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $19,500 per annum".

(28)(A) Section 308 of title 39, United States Code, fixing the annual rate of basic compensation of the position of Chief Postal Inspector in the Post Office Department at $19,000.

(B) That part of the table of contents of chapter 3 of title 39, United States Code, which reads as follows: "308. Chief Postal Inspector.".

(29) That part of the first sentence of section 4 of the International Travel Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 130; 22 U.S.C. 2124), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the United States Travel Service in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "who shall be compensated at the rate of $19,000 per annum,".

(30) Section 14(b) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 716; 5 U.S.C. 3013(b)), which fixes the compensation of the Executive Director of the United States Civil Service Commission at $19,000 per annum.

(31) That part of the first sentence of section 107(c) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (73 Stat. 211; 50 U.S.C. App. 1217(c)), relating to the annual salary of the General Counsel of the Renegotiation Board which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at the rate of $19,000 per annum".

(32)(A) That part of the third sentence in section 201(a) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 538; 40 U.S.C. 661(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency, which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the maximum rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, plus $500 per annum".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 201(b) of such Act (74 Stat. 538; 40 U.S.C. 661(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Agency, which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the maximum rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(33) The last sentence of section 624(d)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 447; 22 U.S.C. 2384(d)(1)), as amended, fixing the compensation of certain officials in the Department of State, which reads: "The Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 annually; the Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 annually, and each Assistant Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $19,000 annually.".

(34) That part of section 202 of the Act of July 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 305; 5 U.S.C. 623g), relating to the annual salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which reads: ", and whose annual rate of basic compensation shall be $19,000".

(35) That part of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1963, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR" and under the caption "BUREAU OF RECLAMATION" and the subheading "ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS" (76 Stat. 1223; 43 U.S.C. 373a–1), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Commission of the Bureau of Reclamation, which reads:

"After September 30, 1962, the position of Commissioner of Reclamation shall have the annual rate of compensation as provided for positions listed in section 2205(a) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent.".

(36) That part of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1962, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR" and under the caption "BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION" and the subheading "CONSTRUCTION" (75 Stat. 728; 16 U.S.C. 832a–1), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, which reads:

"After October 1, 1961, the position of Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, shall have the same annual rate of compensation as that provided for positions

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

listed in section 2205(b) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent.".

(37) Section 205 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1958) (71 Stat. 423; 5 U.S.C. 483–1 note, 2206 note), as amended, relating to the salary of the present incumbent of the position of Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the Department of the Interior, and to the salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of such Department, which reads:

"SEC. 205. After August 31, 1957, the salary of the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration shall be the same as the salary of the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, so long as held by the present incumbent; and the salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Department shall be the same as the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.".

(38) The proviso in the first paragraph under the heading "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION" and under the subheading "SALARIES and EXPENSES" in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1964 (77 Stat. 782; Public Law 88–245), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which reads: ": *Provided*, That the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be $22,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent" and provisions to the same effect contained in other appropriation Acts enacted prior to the effective date of this section relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(39) That part of section 7801(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, relating to the annual salary of the Assistant General Counsel of the Treasury Department who shall be the Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, which reads: "and shall receive basic compensation at the annual rate of $19,000".

(40)(A) Sections 3018, 5014, and 8018 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the general counsels of the military departments.

(B) The respective tables of contents of chapters 303, 503, and 803 of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking out

"3018. Compensation of General Counsel.";
"5014. Compensation of General Counsel."; and
"8018. Compensation of General Counsel.".

(41)(A) That part of section 2(a) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1962 (76 Stat. 1253; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the compensation of the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum".

(B) That part of section 2(b) of such reorganization plan (76 Stat. 1253; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the compensation of the Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, which reads: "and receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum".

(C) That part of section 22(a) of such reorganization plan (76 Stat. 1255; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the compensation of the Director of the National Science Foundation, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,000 per annum and".

(42) That part of section 624(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 447; 22 U.S.C. 2384(a)), relating to the compensation of twelve officers in the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of such Act, which reads: "of whom—

"(1) one shall have the rank of an Under Secretary and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Under Secretary of an Executive Department;

"(2) one shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretary and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Deputy Under Secretary of an executive department; and

"(3) ten shall have the rank of Assistant Secretaries and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Assistant Secretary of an executive department,".

(43) That part of the first sentence of section 104(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 174; 8 U.S.C. 1104(b)), relating to the rank and compensation of the Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, which reads: "and compensation".

SEC. 306. (a)(1) Section 508 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 508. Salaries

"Subject to subsection (f) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, the Attorney General shall fix the annual salaries of United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title at rates of compensation not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.".

(2) Subject to section 303(f) of this Act, each incumbent United States attorney and assistant United States attorney shall be paid compensation at a rate equal to that of attorneys of comparable responsibility and professional qualifications, as determined by the Attorney General, whose compensation is prescribed in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) Section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (70 Stat. 704; 22 U.S.C. 866), relating to the per annum salaries of chiefs of mission, is amended by striking out the second sentence of that section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The per annum salaries of chiefs of mission within each class shall be at the rate provided by law for the levels of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule as follows: class 1, the rate for level II; class 2, the rate for level III; class 3, the rate for level IV; and class 4, the rate for level V.".

(c) That part of section 201(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)), fixing a limit of $19,000 on the compensation of seven persons in the National Aeronautics and Space Council, is amended by striking out "compensated at the rate of not more than $19,000 a year," and inserting in lieu thereof "compensated at not to exceed the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,".

(d) Clause (A) of section 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "(A) to the extent the Administrator deems such action necessary to the discharge of his responsibilities, he may appoint not more than four hundred and twenty-five of the scientific, engineering, and administrative personnel of the Administration without regard to such laws, and may fix the compensation of such personnel not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and".

(e) Section 6(f) of the Act of September 24, 1959 (73 Stat. 706; 5 U.S.C. 2376(f)), relating to the maximum compensation payable to employees of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, is amended by striking out "at a rate in excess of $20,000 per annum" and by inserting in lieu thereof "at a rate in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(f) The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) In the last sentence of section 24 a. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(a)), relating to the annual salary of the General Manager of such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the Commission" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $22,000 per annum";

(2) In the last sentence of section 24 b. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy General Manager of such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the General Manager" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $20,500 per annum";

(3) In the last sentence of section 24 c. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(c)), relating to the annual salaries of the Assistant General Managers (or their equivalents) of such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the General Manager" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $20,000 per annum";

(4) In the second sentence of section 25 a. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035 (a)), relating to the annual salaries of directors of program divisions of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum";

(5) In section 25 b. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(b)), relating to the annual salary of the General Counsel of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,500 per annum";

(6) In the first sentence of section 25 c. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(c)), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the Inspection Division in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum";

(7) In the last sentence of section 25 d. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(d)), relating to the annual salaries of certain executive management positions in such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the General Manager" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum"; and

(8) In the second sentence of section 28 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2038), relating to the compensation of the active member of the Armed Forces serving as Director of the Division of Military Application in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads "and the compensation prescribed in section 25" and inserting in lieu thereof "and the compensation established for this position pursuant to section 303 or section 309 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964".

(g) Section 2 of the Act of July 30, 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 712; 70 Stat. 740; 22 U.S.C. 287n), relating to the compensation of the United States representatives and alternates at sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, is amended by striking out "Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive com-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

pensation at such rates, not to exceed $15,000 per annum, as the President may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof "Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at such rates provided for Foreign Service officers in the schedule contained in section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, as the President may determine,".

(h) The third sentence of section 2 of the Act of May 29, 1959 (73 Stat. 63; 50 U.S.C. 402, note), is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in subsection (f) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, no officer or employee of the National Security Agency shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of the highest rate of basic compensation contained in such General Schedule.".

(i) (1) Sections 2 and 3 of the Act of July 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 414; D.C. Code, secs. 1–204a and 1–204b), relating to the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided by this section and section 3 of this Act—

"(1) the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $25,500 each per annum; and

"(2) the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall receive an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) the compensation of the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $26,000 per annum; and

"(2) if the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army is chosen President of the Board of Commissioners, he shall receive, as President of the Board, an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section.".

(2) Section 11–702(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 484; Public Law 88–241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, is amended—

(A) by striking out "$19,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000"; and

(B) by striking out "$18,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$24,500".

(3) Section 11–902(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 487; Public Law 88–241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, is amended—

(A) by striking out "$18,000" and inserting in lieu therof "$24,000"; and

(B) by striking out "$17,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$23,500".

(4) The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2402), relating to the compensation of the person appointed to the District of Columbia Tax Court, is amended by striking out '$17,500" and inserting in lieu thereof $23,500".

(5) That part of the salary schedule in section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (76 Stat. 1229; D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501), relating to the compensation of the Superintendent of Schools, and Deputy Superintendent of Schools, of the District of Columbia, which reads:

"Class 1: Superintendent of Schools $19,000
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent .. 16,500"

is amended to read as follows:

"Class 1: Superintendent of Schools $25,000
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent .. 21,000"

(6) That part of the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 480), as amended (sec. 4–823, et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 edition), relating to the compensation of the Fire Chief and the Chief of Police, which reads:

"Class 10 Fire Chief. Chief of Police."	17,000	17,400	17,800	18,200			18,600	19,000

is amended to read as follows:

"Class 10 Fire Chief. Chief of Police."	20,000	20,500	21,000	21,500			22,000	22,500

(j) (1) The catchline of section 3012 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(2) The table of contents of chapter 303 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"3012. Secretary of the Army: powers and duties; delegation by; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"3012. Secretary of the Army: powers and duties; delegation by.".

(3) The catchline of section 5031 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(4) The table of contents of chapter 505 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"5031. Secretary of the Navy: responsibilities; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"5031. Secretary of the Navy: responsibilities.".

(5) The catchline of section 5033 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(6) The table of contents of chapter 505 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"5033. Under Secretary of the Navy: appointment; duties; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"5033. Under Secretary of the Navy: appointment; duties.".

(7) The catchline of section 8012 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(8) The table of contents of chapter 803 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers duties; delegation by; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers and duties; delegation by.".

Changes in position titles

SEC. 307. Whenever reference is made in any law or reorganization plan to the—

Administrative Assistant Attorney General,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Labor,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury,

or

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,

such reference shall be held and considered to mean the—

Assistant Attorney General for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of Labor for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Administration, or

Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Administration,

respectively.

Limitation on salaries fixed by administrative action

SEC. 308. Except as provided by this Act and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the head of any executive department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch who is authorized to fix by administrative action the annual rate of basic compensation for any position, officer, or employee shall not fix such rate in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to impair the authorities provided in the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended (50 U.S.C. 403a and following), in section 3 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831b), in section 9 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1819), in section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 248), or in section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 481, relating to the Comptroller of the Currency).

Positions placed under Classification Act of 1949

SEC. 309. Each office or position in the executive branch specifically referred to in, or covered by, any conforming change in law made by section 305 of this Act, or any other office or position in the executive branch for which the annual salary is established pursuant to special provision of law enacted prior to July 1, 1964, at a figure of $18,500 or above, which is not placed in a level of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule pursuant to section 303 of this Act, shall receive pay equivalent to a grade and step of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. All actions taken under this section shall be reported to the United States Civil Service Commission and published in the Federal Register, except when it is determined by the President that such report and publication would be contrary to the interest of national security.

Saving provisions

SEC. 310. (a) Except as provided by this Act, the changes in existing law made by this Act shall not affect any office or position existing immediately prior to the effective date of any such changes in existing law, the compensation attached to such office or position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his entitlement to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken in accordance with this Act or other law.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the rate of basic, gross, or total annual compensation received by any officer or em-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ployee immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall not be reduced by reason of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "Federal Judicial Salary Act of 1964".

SEC. 402. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 672 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 28, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding ungraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(d) Section 40a of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 68(a)), as amended, relating to the compensation of full-time and part-time referees in bankruptcy, is amended by striking out the existing compensation limitations contained therein and inserting new limitations of "$22,500" and "$11,000", respectively.

SEC. 403. (a) Section 5 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, is amended by striking out "$35,500" and substituting therefor "$43,000", and by striking out "$35,000" and substituting therefor "$42,500".

(b) Section 44(d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to circuit judges, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

(c) Section 135 of title 28, United States Code, relating to district judges, is amended by striking out "$22,500" and substituting therefor "$30,000", and by striking out "$23,000" and substituting therefor "$30,500".

(d) Section 173 of title 28, United States Code relating to judges of the Court of Claims, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

(e) Section 213 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

(f) Section 252 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Customs Court, is amended by striking out "$22,500" and substituting therefor "$30,000".

(g) The first paragraph of section 603 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the Director and the Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, is amended to read as follows:

"The Director shall receive a salary of $27,000 a year. The Deputy Director shall receive a salary of $26,000 a year."

(h) Subsection (b) of section 792 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of commissioners of the Court of Claims, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each commissioner shall receive basic compensation at the rate of $26,000 a year, and also all necessary traveling expenses and a per diem allowance as provided in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business and away from Washington, District of Columbia."

(i) Section 7443(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (68A Stat. 879), as amended, relating to judges of the Tax Court of the United States, is further amended by striking out "$22,500" and substituting therefor "$30,000".

(j) Section 867(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Military Appeals, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 501. (a) Except to the extent provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, this Act and the increases in compensation made by this Act shall become effective on July 1, 1964.

(b) Section 204 of this Act, relating to increases in compensation for Members of Congress, shall become effective at noon on January 3, 1965.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (but except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section)—

(1) no rate of compensation which is equal to or in excess of $22,000 per annum shall be increased in any amount, by reason of section 202 of this Act, until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1965; and

(2) no rate of compensation which is less than $22,000 per annum shall be increased to an amount per annum in excess of $22,000, by reason of section 202 or 203(g) of this Act, until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the precedents of the Senate, the committee substitute for this bill is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, and is therefore subject to amendment in two degrees. Amendments to the House text or any amendment thereto has precedence over the committee substitute or any amendment to it.

The vote on the substitute, whether amended or not, will not come until after all perfecting amendments, either to the original bill or the substitute itself have been disposed of.

The committee amendment, when agreed to, is not subject to further amendment.

OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived for the duration of my comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last Thursday afternoon, nearly a week ago, the Secretary of the Interior announced the Government's decision on the level of oil imports under the mandatory oil import program for the last half of 1964.

This decision came after strong appeals from dozens of U.S. Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, 20 Governors, and strong grassroots support for a substantial reduction in the level of crude oil imports.

What was the decision?

Instead of a substantial reduction, the program announced increased oil imports into the United States for the last half of 1964 by more than 100,000 barrels per day over the same period of last year. This was done in spite of the Department's conclusion in its Thursday announcement that:

> The Department also announced the preliminary results of a review of the basic economic position confronting the domestic producing industry. The tentative conclusions from the study indicate that there has been a gradual erosion in the crude price structure throughout the United States, and that despite moderate increases in crude production, domestic producers are being confronted with increasing difficulties.

Mr. President, I find this action incomprehensible in light of the seriously depressed conditions now prevailing in this vital domestic industry.

Why did 16 Senators, including myself, and my colleague from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] join in a strong bipartisan appeal to the President for a substantial reduction in oil imports?

Why did dozens of other Senators and Members of the House address individual appeals to the President, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Defense, imploring them to greatly reduce the levels of oil imports into this country?

Why did 20 State Governors send a telegram to President Johnson declaring:

> Governors of several oil States request your assistance in the establishment of oil import quotas which comply with the congressional mandate aimed at insuring continued domestic exploration and the development of domestic supplies adequate to meet the needs of our national security.

Why did the Independent Petroleum Association of America, representing 10,000 oil and gas producers, joined by more than 30 State and local associations, petition the President and the Secretary of the Interior for prompt relief from this evergrowing tide of foreign oil?

Mr. President, I will tell you why.

This Nation is facing a steady deterioration of one of the basic industries—an industry which in my mind is the most important national security tool this Nation has.

It is even more important, relatively speaking, to my own State of Wyoming, where it constitutes by far the largest segment of our State's economy. Wyoming ranks fifth among the oil-producing States.

We are witnessing the continual decline of an industry which in the past has been called upon to produce the petroleum so vital to successfully prosecute wars, stand off and deter war threats, help other friendly nations in

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

LEAD

Consumption of lead in the United States has been increasing in recent years, with the available supply being exceeded by nearly 40,000 short tons in both 1962 and 1963. The total U.S. consumption of 1,154,300 short tons in 1963 was the highest since 1957 when consumption was 1,138,115 short tons.

The stockpile objective for lead was reduced by the Office of Emergency Planning from 286,000 short tons to zero on June 17, 1963. As a consequence the inventory of 1,378,453 short tons of lead in excess of estimated stockpile requirements. The committee was informed that the developing lead shortage in the commercial market may become serious during 1964. Consequently the present circumstances seem more favorable for an orderly disposal of lead surpluses than they have in recent years.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

The objective of this bill is similar to that of S. 2933, introduced by the junior Senator from West Virginia, [Mr. BYRD], and S. 2867, which was introduced by the senior Senator from West Virginia, [Mr. RANDOLPH].

FISCAL DATA

The average acquisition cost of the lead in the national stockpile was $0.1445 per pound. Current market prices for lead, the highest in several years, are about $0.13 per pound.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator tell us how much lead and zinc is involved?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There are 75,000 tons of zinc; and 50,000 tons of lead.

Mr. MONRONEY. Can the Senator state whether the committee is satisfied it will have no adverse effect on the commodity?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that those who are most eager to have the disposals approved are the users of the materials. There is a critical shortage.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would not adversely affect the current market, in the judgment of the Senator?

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the opinion of the disposal experts of the General Services Administration, and in the judgment of the committee, it would not.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator. I know of his great interest in this subject. His State is an important producer of the material.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to know whether the pay increase would also apply to retired judges who are drawing full pay for life.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, inactive judges drawing full pay are not specifically mentioned in this bill. But under the law that is already on the statute books, they would.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That means that a judge who is retired would also get the benefit of this pay increase?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged against the time on either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield briefly to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that the next amendment will be one to be offered by the Senator from Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent—and I hope this meets with the approval of the Senate—that, from now on, there be a time limitation, on each amendment, of one-half an hour, with 15 minutes to be allotted to the proponents and 15 minutes to be allotted to the opponents, and with the time to be controlled, respectively, by the mover of the amendment and the Senator from South Carolina, respectively; and that 2 hours be available on the question of the passage of the bill, with the time to be controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time, and to whom? Do Senators who are in charge of the time on the Williams amendment yield back the remaining time under their control?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, how much time remains available to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 4 minutes remaining; the Senator from South Carolina has 6 minutes remaining.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does either side yield time to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to have only about 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if I cannot get any time now, I shall offer an amendment of my own.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall try to get the time for the Senator from Arkansas. I have yielded almost all the time I have.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I do not know on which side the Senator intends to speak. I am willing to give him 1 minute of my time. I suggest that the Senator from Delaware yield him 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to resolve the issue, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to make one statement. One of the reasons why I cannot support the bill is that the Government is operating at a continuous deficit. Later I shall make a short statement on the bill, but that is one of the reasons why I cannot support the bill.

When the tax reduction bill was before the Senate, I offered an amendment which would link the reduction to a balanced budget. In a sense, my position now is comparable. The same principle is involved as was involved in the previous amendment.

I commend those who have offered the amendment. I shall support it. I do not believe—and I will repeat the statement again in my remarks—that we have any moral right to raise our salaries and charge the cost to future generations. We should not increase the deficit under which the Government is now operating.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield 2 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 2 minutes to the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will not prevail. Very simply, it provides that there shall be no salary increase in the case of those whose salary is now $20,000 or over, until the Federal budget is balanced.

I sat through all the tax hearings held by the Senate Committee on Finance. Some of the best testimony we had was from none other than Arthur Burns, the economist and chairman of economic advisers in the Eisenhower administration. It was his opinion, contrary to that of some others, including the Secretary of the Treasury, that we could not see a balanced budget until 1972. That is 8 years from now.

I should like to invite attention to what is involved. It touches an amount equal to one quarter of 1 percent of the money that is carried in the bill. That is the total sum. It is in the neighborhood of about $16 million. If there is any virtue in that kind of attitude on the bill, we ought to start reducing every appropriation by half if we are to make any progress in that direction. In my judgment, at best the proposal is only a gesture; therefore I trust that the amendment will be rejected.

FARM PARITY DOWN—NO TIME TO RAISE CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wonder if the minority leader would yield me an extra minute on the bill.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

mediate consideration of the four measures referred to?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 300) authorizing the disposal of approximately 98,000 long tons of pig tin from the national stockpile was considered and agreed to.

The excerpts from the report (No. 1166) presented by Mr. SYMINGTON are as follows:

PURPOSE

This resolution would grant congressional consent to the disposal of 98,000 long tons of pig tin now held in the national stockpile.

TIN

A notice of a proposed disposal of 98,000 short tons of pig tin was published in the Federal Register on March 27, 1964, 29 F.R. 3838, and the Congress was asked to approve the disposal.

On July 26, 1963, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning established a revised stockpile objective for tin at 200,000 long tons. As of May 15, 1964, the quantity of tin in inventory in excess of this objective, after sales commitments, was 123,541 long tons. Of this excess quantity 25,541 long tons remained to be sold from a disposal program of 50,000 long tons approved by House Concurrent Resolution 473, which was agreed to by the House on June 1, 1962, and by the Senate on June 21, 1962. Hence the quantity of tin in the national stockpile that is excess to requirements and that has not been previously approved for disposal is approximately 98,000 long tons.

Consumption of tin within the United States declined from 83,000 long tons in 1929 to about 55,000 long tons in 1963. Consumption throughout the free world has shown a steady increase in the last 5 years—from 136,000 long tons in 1958 to 158,500 long tons in 1963. This free world consumption is estimated to increase to 175,000 long tons annually by 1968. Free world production of tin has increased over that of 5 years ago, but it has not kept pace with consumption. The output has increased from 121,124 long tons in 1958 to 146,700 long tons in 1963 and this is expected to increase to 158,200 long tons by 1968. The estimate consequently is that there will be a deficit of about 20,000 long tons annually over the long term.

The disposal plan for tin contemplates that the 25,541 long tons that are the remaining unsold balance under House Concurrent Resolution 473 of the 87th Congress will be merged with the 98,000 long tons that are the subject of this resolution. The total excess will be disposed of over a period of approximately 6 to 8 years. The General Services Administration has announced that it expects to dispose of approximately 20,000 long tons of tin during the first year of the program and that the disposal plan will be reviewed at least annually by the Administrator of General Services in consultation with other interested departments and agencies.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

The objective of this resolution is similar to Senate Concurrent Resolution 77, introduced by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

FISCAL DATA

The average acquisition cost of the pig tin in the national stockpile was $1.0855 per pound. The average return to the Government from the disposal action authorized by House Concurrent Resolution 473 of the 87th Congress has been $1.26 per pound. The current market prices for pig tin are in the range of $1.50 to $1.56 per pound. The General Services Administration estimates that the price for pig tin will continue to remain favorable for this disposal action.

DISPOSAL OF MOLYBDENUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 11235) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The excerpts from the report (No. 1163) presented by Mr. SYMINGTON are, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) grant congressional approval for the disposal of 11 million pounds of molybdenum now held in the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required before disposals of strategic and critical materials may be made from the national stockpile.

MOLYBDENUM

Molybdenum is a basic industrial raw material used chiefly in the manufacture of alloy, steels, and chemicals. An uninterrupted supply of this material is essential to the economies of highly industrialized nations.

The United States is the largest producer and consumer of molybdenum in the world. U.S. production was 66 million pounds in 1963. The only other significant supplies of molybdenum available to the free world are in Chile, which now produces about 5 million pounds annually.

U.S. consumption of molybdenum has increased from 24 million pounds in 1958 to 48 million pounds in 1963. Although production in the United States exceeds domestic consumption, the strong demand for molybdenum by other industrialized countries of the free world has created pressure upon the supplies of the U.S. producers.

The committee was informed that U.S. producers of molybdenum are taking steps to meet increased demands from ample molybdenum ore reserves but that because of the lag between consumer demand and production a balance between demand and supply is not immediately foreseeable and the present shortage may continue for some time. This gives the Government an opportunity to dispose of some excess molybdenum and also to satisfy an urgent immediate need for the material in our domestic industry.

If this bill is approved the General Services Administration plans an initial sales offering of 2 million pounds on a competitive basis. Subsequent offerings would be made periodically, depending upon the evaluation of previous sales and of existing market conditions. Disposals would be limited to domestic consumption.

The current stockpile objective for molybdenum is 68 million pounds. The inventory in the national stockpile is slightly more than 79 million pounds. This bill would permit the disposal of all the molybdenum that is surplus to stockpile objectives.

FISCAL DATA

The average acquisition cost of molybdenum in the national stockpile was $1.06 per pound. Current market prices are approximately $1.55 per pound. Disposals under House Concurrent Resolution 473 of the 87th Congress resulted in an average return to the Government of $1.448 per pound.

SALE OF ZINC

The bill (H.R. 11004) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The excerpts from the report (No. 1165) presented by Mr. SYMINGTON are, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) grant congressional approval for the disposal of approximately 75,000 short tons of zinc now held in the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required before disposals of strategic and critical materials may be made from the national stockpile.

ZINC

Zinc that would be disposed of under this bill is excess to present mobilization requirements of the Government. The current stockpile objective for zinc is zero. The inventory of zinc in the national stockpile is 1,580,643 short tons.

Within the last 2 years U.S. consumption of zinc has reached near record levels—1,013,821 short tons in 1962, and 1,081,354 short tons in 1963. The year of record consumption was 1955, when 1,119,812 short tons were used.

The consumption of zinc in the United States is primarily by the automotive industry, which uses the material in dye castings and for galvanizing. Use of zinc in the production of automobiles is increasing and the present estimate is that zinc consumption in 1964 will surpass the record year of 1955.

Domestic mine production of zinc ore is insufficient to meet our requirements. As a result, the United States depends upon foreign sources of supply for almost one-half of the smelting ores needed here. The U.S. consumption of zinc has exceeded domestic production by about 100,000 short tons a year for the past 2 years. Consumers in the United States are experiencing difficulties in securing needed supplies. The excess zinc in the national stockpile is more than adequate to satisfy consumer needs that the producing industry is now unable to fulfill. This condition affords the Government an opportunity to dispose of surplus zinc from the stockpile without an unfavorable impact upon the market and it also meets an important industrial need.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

The objective of this bill is similar to that of S. 2768, which was introduced by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

FISCAL DATA

The average acquisition cost of zinc in the national stockpile was $0.1449 per pound. Current market prices range from $0.1350 to $0.1475 per pound. The General Services Administration estimates that the price of zinc will continue to remain favorable during the period of the proposed disposal action.

SALE OF LEAD

The bill (H.R. 11257) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of lead proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock-Piling Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The excerpts from the report (No. 1164) presented by Mr. SYMINGTON are, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) grant congressional approval for the disposal of 50,000 tons of lead now held in the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required before disposals of strategic and critical materials may be made from the national stockpile.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall support the Williams amendment. It seems to me that if nothing else can be said about the proposed pay raise bill, it can be recorded as the masterpiece of bad timing of the 20th century.

A 33-percent increase in our salaries has been proposed at a time when we have recently increased, once again, the national debt limit, at a time when we have denied the people a reduction in excise taxes which the Senate voted and surrendered in conference and at a time when the whole agricultural economy of our country is in the doldrums. I do not believe that anyone could have conceived a worst time in which to propose this kind of bill to propose increasing congressional salaries.

However, with the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] it seems to me that we could in good conscience support the proposed legislation.

First. The amendment would not delay for one single second increasing the salary of anyone in the Federal Government who is receiving less than $20,000. I am strongly in favor of the legitimate pay increases suggested for these lower income Federal employees.

Second. The proposal would afford an inducement to the policymakers of our country—who are the people in Congress and in the executive department who are getting over $20,000—to develop some economic programs which will stimulate our economy so that we can have a balanced budget.

I see nothing in the record of expenditures on the part of the policymakers thus far that should give them a 33⅓-percent increase in salary, because they have consistently kept our country in the red. Surely the policymakers in the executive and legislative branches of Government deserve no bonus in the form of pay increases for a record of that kind.

Mr. President, I point out what has happened to the agricultural economy as an example of our failures. This morning in my office I received the release from the Department of Agriculture for June on agricultural prices. The release shows that parity for farmers in this country has dropped to 74 percent. That is the lowest since August 1939. It represents another full point drop from a month ago.

The proposal comes at a time when those engaged in the beef industry in this country are going broke because of imports and poor prices, and at a time when farmers generally are receiving prices which are only 74 percent of parity. It seems to me highly logical and persuasive that we should defer the proposed increase in salaries for ourselves, for judges in retirement, and for policymakers who are earning over $20,000 a year until such time as we have produced programs—and we have enacted them—which will provide for a balancing of the budget.

This New Frontier idea of voting ourselves a 33⅓-percent increase in salaries out of borrowed money does not add up as sound or right in anyone's arithmetic book. We ought to consider the Williams proposal seriously and say to the policymakers, "All right. Your policies have failed. You have been consistently putting this country into the red, in this time of peace and prosperity. You have submerged the agricultural economy to 74 percent of parity. Come forth with something worthwhile. Come forward with some economies. Come up with some stimulus and incentive to industry, business, and agriculture so we can produce the money to balance the budget. Then will be the time to increase the salaries of those in the higher salary brackets who hold the responsibility for policymaking in our Government. Perhaps the inducement of a pay raise predicated on a better performance record will help get the sensible solutions our problems require."

Our present Federal policies, Mr. President, are failing our American farmers and ranchers very seriously. This administration was elected on the promise of "parity prices for agriculture." Instead, import practices and Department of Agriculture policies forced through a Congress which this administration dominates by a 2-to-1 majority have put parity prices so low they are averaging from 8 to 10 percent lower than during the Eisenhower Republican years. Look at the record. In June of 1960 under Eisenhower, parity stood at 78 percent; and in June of 1961 was still 78 percent; in June of 1962 it remained at 78 percent with no progress toward the promised goal of 100 percent parity prices for farmers. By June of 1963 parity had dropped in fact to 77 percent and in June of this year—as of today—it has sagged to 74 percent. Policymakers paid over $20,000 or more per year surely deserve no pay increase for that type of record and neither do the Members of this Congress.

I should add that during every other June of the Eisenhower administration parity ranged from 81 to 92 percent, so we have had a total drop from the first year of the Republican administration parity level of 92 percent for farm prices in 1953 to 74 percent of parity today—a total drop during these past 11 years of 18 percent. As a Senator from a farm State I cannot in good conscience vote for a pay-increase bill raising by some 33⅓ percent the salaries of policymakers now receiving over $20,000 per year in the face of such a sorry record of performance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me 1 minute on the bill to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, retired Supreme Court Judges are receiving $35,000 for life. They are inactive. We have also inactive judges of the circuit courts of appeals and the district court of the United States. Does the Senator know that everyone of those inactive judges who are presently receiving, respectively, $35,000 a year, $25,500, and $22,500 would have the benefit of the proposed increase?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, the Senator knows that. In addition the Senator from South Dakota knows something else. He knows that the judges' plush lifetime pension of full salaries is a noncontributory pension to which the judges contribute not one single dime. It is paid for entirely by the taxpayers. I do not think that now is the time to reward them with an increase in retirement benefits paid for by borrowed money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the amendment, I wish to speak briefly on it.

Yesterday many Senators who were supporting the bill referred to the U.S. Government as the largest corporation in the world. They said that, therefore, we ought to pay the executives commensurate salaries and bring them up to the levels proposed in the bill.

I submit to the Senate that if we actually had a corporation with a board of directors which had consistently operated that corporation in the red for many years, and is now programing a period of continuing activity to run it in the red for the next 7 or 8 years, there would be short shrift for the members of the executive department who were operating that corporation.

The amendment would provide an incentive for those who are operating the so-called corporation—the Members of the House, the Senate, and the executive department downtown—to change the operation from one which is in the red to one which is in the black in order to try to get some kind of balanced budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time? The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I will take the 1 minute remaining on my amendment.

I call attention to the fact that only last week the Congress rejected the repeal of retail excise taxes on the theory that we could not finance the deficit on borrowed money. How can we tell the people that we could not cut taxes because we cannot finance the deficit on borrowed money but that we can increase our own salaries by 33⅓ percent and do not mind doing it with borrowed money?

We were told last week that $7 billion of the $9 billion request for an increase in the debt ceiling this year is to make up the loss in revenues resulting from the tax cut of last January. Here is another $500 or $600 million increase in salaries.

I am proposing, under the amendment, to postpone the effective date of the increase of salaries in excess of $20,000 un-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

til we can demonstrate to the American people that we are worthy of it and can earn it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Tuesday, June 30, in which it was pointed out that the Senate of the United States cannot recover its prestige solely by increasing the salaries of its Members.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESTIGE?—DIGNITY?—STATUS?

Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, and his colleagues of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee have now formally recommended in a written report that all Senators and Representatives be paid an additional $7,500 a year.

Their bill, scheduled for Senate action this week, also provides pay increases for all other Federal employees, judges, congressional help, and postmasters. It follows the pattern of the one passed by the House and ups the lawmakers' pay from $22,500 to $30,000 a year.

The Johnston report argues that the "increasing cost of serving in Washington" is one reason for the pay increase, not mentioning that no Congressman ever was hogtied and made to take his job. He sought it of his own free will, and was glad enough to get it.

But when the report says that "also involved (in the proposed pay increase) is the prestige, dignity, and status of the Congress and its Members," it is indulging in as ridiculous a bit of sophistry as we've ever seen in a congressional report.

Senators should know money won't buy prestige. If it's prestige they want, let them write a law (and obey it) to end congressional conflicts of interest and set up a rigid and honest congressional code of ethics.

If it's dignity they want, more pay won't assure it, but an end of nepotism might.

And if it's status they so greatly desire, they should know that raiding the Treasury in their own behalf won't achieve it. Let them seek status by putting an end to sponging on the Federal Treasury with lush Government-paid junkets disguised as fact-finding or investigative trips, and let them pass an honest clean elections law to assure complete and instant disclosure of all campaign contributions and expenditures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield back my time, and I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is absent on official business.

I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 65, as follows:

[No. 461 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Bennett	Jordan, Idaho	Robertson
Boggs	Lausche	Russell
Byrd, Va.	McClellan	Simpson
Church	McGovern	Talmadge
Curtis	Mechem	Thurmond
Dominick	Miller	Tower
Ellender	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Goldwater	Pearson	Young, Ohio
Hruska	Proxmire	

NAYS—65

Aiken	Hart	Metcalf
Allott	Hartke	Monroney
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Morton
Beall	Hill	Moss
Bible	Holland	Muskie
Brewster	Humphrey	Nelson
Burdick	Inouye	Neuberger
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Pastore
Cannon	Javits	Pell
Carlson	Johnston	Prouty
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Clark	Keating	Ribicoff
Cooper	Kuchel	Scott
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Smith
Dodd	Long, La.	Sparkman
Douglas	Magnuson	Stennis
Eastland	Mansfield	Symington
Ervin	McCarthy	Walters
Fulbright	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—9

Bayh	Engle	Saltonstall
Cotton	Fong	Smathers
Edmondson	Kennedy	Yarborough

So the amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported the following nominations:

Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff;

Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, U.S. Army, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general;

Lt. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, in the grade of general; and

Lt. Gen. Creighton Williams Abrams, Jr., Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general while so serving.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may consider the nominations of certain Army officers, whose nominations I have just reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be stated.

IN THE U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, U.S. Army, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, U.S. Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, in the grade of general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Creighton Williams Abrams, Jr., Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general while so serving.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1087.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point. I can explain it very quickly.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

TITLE VI

That each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives (including each Delegate and Resident Commissioner); each officer and employee of the United States who (1) receives a salary at a rate of $10,000 or more per annum or (2) holds a position of grade GS–15 or above, and each officer in the Armed Forces of the rank of colonel, or its equivalent, and above; and each member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party shall file annually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) the amount and resources of all income and gifts (of $100 or more in money or value, or in the case of multiple gifts from one person, aggregating $100 or more in money or value) received by him or any person on his behalf during the preceding calendar year;

(2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by or to him and any other person and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him together with any other person as of the close of the preceding year; and

(3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year to any person who received anything of value on his behalf or subject to his direction or control or who, with his acquiescence, makes payments for any liability or expense incurred by him.

SEC. 2. Each person required by the first section to file reports shall, in addition, file semiannually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of all dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding six-month period.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the reports required by the first section of this Act shall be filed not later than March 31 of each year; and the reports required by section 2 shall be filed not later than July 31 of each year for the six-month period ending June 30 of such year, and not later than January 31 of each year for the six-month period ending December 31 of the preceding year.

(b) In the case of any person required to file reports under this Act whose service terminates prior to the date prescribed by subsection (a) as the date for filing any report, such report shall be filed on the last day of such person's service, or on such later date, not more than three months after the termination of such service, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

SEC. 4. The reports required by this Act shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, and dealings in securities or commodities, when separate itemization is not feasible or not necessary for an accurate disclosure of a person's income, net worth, or dealings in securities, and commodities.

SEC. 5. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act or who willfully and knowingly files a false report shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 6. (a) As used in this Act—

(1) the term "income" means gross income as defined in section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 77b).

(3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 7, sec. 2).

(4) the term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

(5) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

(b) For the purposes of any report required by this Act, a person shall be considered to be a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, an officer or employee of the United States and of the armed services as described in the first section of this Act, or a member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party, if he served (with or without compensation) in any such position during the period to be covered by such report, not withstanding that his service may have terminated prior to December 31 of such calendar year.

SEC. 7. The Comptroller General shall have authority to issue, reissue, and amend rules and regulations governing the publication of reports, or any part of them. He shall prescribe fees to cover the cost of reproduction. In formulating such rules and regulations, he shall seek to maximize the availability of reports for purposes of informing the public and agencies and officials of the Federal and local government, and to minimize use of such records for private purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is the Morse full disclosure bill offered as an amendment to the pending bill. I first introduced it in 1946. For many years I could not even obtain a hearing on the bill. However, last year hearings were held on the bill, along with hearings on other disclosure bills which had been introduced from time to time in the intervening years, particularly in recent years.

The essence of the bill covers these points:

Anyone in Federal employment receiving $10,000 or more a year shall be required to make a full disclosure once each year in accordance with regulations drawn and on forms supplied by the Comptroller General on the matters found at page 2 of the bill, starting at line 3:

(1) the amount and resources of all income and gifts (of $100 or more in money or value, or in the case of multiple gifts from one person, aggregating $100 or more in money or value) received by him or any person on his behalf during the preceding calendar year;

(2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by or to him and any other person and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him together with any other person as of the close of the preceding year; and

(3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year to any person who received anything of value on his behalf or subject to his direction or control or who, with his acquiescence, makes payments for any liability or expense incurred by him.

The penalties are set out at the bottom of page 3 as follows:

SEC. 5. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act or who willfully and knowingly files a false report shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

Mr. President, Senators know the position I have taken on this matter. I have told the majority leader that I shall not consume much time on the amendment. He has agreed to my having a yea or nay vote on it. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Working for the Federal Government or receiving one's livelihood from the Federal Government is not a matter of right, but a matter of privilege and opportunity.

The American people are entitled to know the sources of all income of officials of the Government so that they can be the judges of what may be, if any, the relationship between the sources of income and the course of action that Federal employees may take in any particular matter.

I first introduced the bill in 1946 when I became disturbed by what was recognized at that time, namely, certain Members of Congress taking advantage of their position, and taking advantage of certain privileged information that they had, to profit thereby financially.

That danger always lurks, although I am proud to tell the American people that in my 20 years as a Member of the Senate I have served with an overwhelming majority of honorable men and women who are dedicated public servants and who are entitled to the trust of the American people.

But I also know the importance of surveillance. I know the importance of having a procedure that will protect the honorable and the honest. The full-disclosure bill, for which I have fought for so many years, involves a matter of right—the right of the American people to know.

In essence, that is my case, I rest my case. I reserve whatever time I may have remaining, should I decide to yield any of it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. On page 2, line 3, the text of my copy reads "amount and resources."

Mr. MORSE. It should be "sources."

Mr. MONRONEY. Should it be "sources"?

Mr. MORSE. "Sources." That is a typographical error. It should be "sources."

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to have that correction, because that would include the identification of all income, whether it be employment, private business, farming, speechmaking, or anything of that kind.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct; it is all encompassing. The error in the amendment is a printer's error; it is not my error.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. It is true that the Senator from Oregon was the first Member, especially in this body, to propose a conflict-of-interest bill. There are a number of us who have come to the Senate more recently who share in general, although not in particular, his views.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and I have had pending for some time before the Committee on Rules and Administration a somewhat similar bill. It is perhaps a matter of undue pride of authorship that we believe our bill is a little more artistically drawn. It has been revised a little more frequently in light of modern conditions and is perhaps a slightly better bill than that of the senior Senator from Oregon. Nevertheless, the provisions of the Senator's bill adequately raise the important question of conflict of interest. I support it fully.

I had intended to make a rather substantial speech in support of my amendment, but I shall not do so because of the unanimous consent agreement which has curtailed our time. I ask the senior Senator from Oregon for the privilege of cosponsoring his amendment, and I shall vote for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have always considered the Senator from Pennsylvania a cosponsor with me in spirit and intent. I am delighted to have his name added to the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio; then I shall yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Within a few weeks after I took my oath in this Chamber in 1959, I filed with the Secretary of the Senate a complete statement of my financial holdings at that time. Because I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I sold certain sugar stocks that I owned; and because I was also a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I sold some Pan American World Airways stock, which I suspected might conflict with my service on that committee. I made a complete disclosure of my financial holdings at that time, so that the citizens of Ohio, whose servant I am, could judge from my votes and my work as their Senator whether or not I was motivated by any selfish purposes in casting any votes.

I compliment the senior Senator from Oregon on the fact that he was a pioneer in proposing conflict-of-interest legislation.

I am somewhat proud of the fact that I was the very first Senator to file a complete statement of assets and financial holdings.

Earlier this year and on other occasions between January 1959, and the present time, I have filed similar reports with the Secretary of the Senate and have made them public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. This year I filed with the Secretary of the Senate, in addition, certified copies of the income tax returns filed last year and the year before by Mrs. Young and me.

Mr. President, the pending pay raise bill will cost taxpayers more than $564 million a year. Furthermore, as the Federal bureaucracy grows, the price tag for this increase will grow with it.

I cannot in good conscience support the bill in its present form. At least four separate legislative proposals were arbitrarily lumped together in this bill providing a pay increase for: postal employees, classified civil service employees, all other members of the executive branch of our Government; also the Federal judiciary; also employees on the staffs of Members of the Congress; and finally Members of Congress.

I had hoped that a separate bill would be introduced for letter carriers, postal clerks, and in fact all postal employees who I feel are the most deserving of an increase in pay at this time. Legislative proposals to accomplish this should be debated and acted upon separate and apart from the pending bill. Such a legislative proposal, I believe, would pass overwhelmingly. I would like to vote for that part of this bill relating to letter carriers and other postal workers in the lower pay brackets. Frankly, I do not believe that a valid argument has been made for increasing the salaries of all civil service employees. There may be—and undoubtedly there are some—positions for which competent people cannot be found because of the salaries offered. For those position I suggest that specific legislation be enacted to correct the problem. I do not see why American taxpayers should have to foot the bill for king-size salary increases for over a million civil service employees just to lure a comparatively few highly skilled people into Government service.

It is my observation that most Government employees in Washington and elsewhere are and have been well paid in comparison with those doing the same work in private industry. Furthermore, those in the classified civil service have job security, sick leave and fringe and retirement benefits far superior to employees in private industry.

Mr. President, regarding the salary increase for Members of the Congress, it is my view that we must set an example by holding the line on wage costs. The President has urged a maximum hold-the-line raise of 3.2 percent in wages and prices. This bill will give Representatives and Senators a 33⅓-percent increase. Frankly, I do not believe that an increase of this magnitude is warranted at this time. I seriously doubt whether there would be any additional candidates for election to the Congress because of the proposed pay raise. No doubt the same men and women would be elected or returned to the Congress. The fact is that very few men and women of high achievement in private life would refuse appointment or certain election to the Senate of the United States, or practically certain election to the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I am glad to note that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee deleted the so-called Udall amendment to the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. In my view it would be unconscionable to tie the salaries of Congressmen and top Federal officials to future pay increases for Federal employees in general. I commend our colleagues on the committee for voting unanimously to delete this provision from the proposed legislation.

As for the staffs of Members of the Congress, and of committees of the Congress, I see no valid reason whatsoever for a salary increase at this time. Senators and Representatives receive ample allowances to hire personnel. These are among the most sought after jobs in Washington. As a matter of fact, every summer we are besieged with requests from young people attending our finest colleges and universities who wish to work without salary for the experience of participating in governmental activities. I am sure that many of my colleagues at this time have interns, so-called, on their staffs who are not drawing pay. I say this merely to emphasize the fact that congressional staff positions do not go begging because of present salary levels.

Frankly, I have not heard any of my colleagues express the opinion that they are unable to obtain qualified personnel for their staffs because of present salary limitations. Nor have I heard the chairmen of various committees of the Congress complain that they are unable to staff their committees because of salary limitations. It should be remembered that employees on senatorial staffs do not have to maintain a residence in their home State as well as one in Washington as Senators do. Frankly, I do not believe that the great majority of our assistants are overworked or underpaid. Many of them—for the most part those on committee staffs—seem to have plenty of time to line the walls of the chamber and watch proceedings out of curiosity when business is being conducted and when Senators are working and voting on legislation of great public interest. Most receive liberal vacations, are not limited by civil service sick-leave requirements, and at the same time are entitled to all civil service fringe benefits. I seriously question whether a pay increase is required for congresisonal staff employees. Are any of them required to spend money campaigning for the well-paid positions they hold? Of course not.

Whenever there is a vacancy on the Federal bench, many, sometimes hundreds, of competent lawyers seek the appointment. There are at most but a few hundred lawyers in our Nation, who, if offered an appointment to the Federal bench, would not accept. Very few lawyers would refuse appointment as U.S. judge at $22,500 a year but would agree to accept were the salary to be increased to $30,000. I would like to know the name of one man in the Nation who would refuse appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court, the highest honor a lawyer may receive, solely because this position pays $35,000 a year and not $42,500.

There are Federal judges today in Ohio and in most other States who have reached retirement age and could have retired years ago. Evidently, they do not feel that they are being underpaid as many continue to serve actively well beyond the retirement age of threescore and ten. Furthermore, it would be dead

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

wrong to increase the salaries paid to those judges who have retired. This bill would do that.

Mr. President, our Government cannot afford to depend upon men and women born to great wealth or who have acquired great wealth to run its affairs. None of us wants that. On the other hand, the Federal Government cannot be absolutely competitive with private industry.

Our Government's only source of income for paying salaries is the taxpayer who already is bearing a heavy burden. The purpose of Government is service whereas the purpose of industry is profit. If the goal is to try to match the pay scale of private industry, then we must accept the fact that the proposed bill is only the first installment. We should realize that the Federal Government should not match the salaries of private industry. We shall always have to rely to a marked degree on many citizens who desire to serve their Government as a public service.

Mr. President, in my judgment this legislation proposes salary increases which are overly generous and in some instances outrageous. It appears to me that there should be separate legislative proposals for the different categories of Federal employees involved. Then the needs of each could be carefully studied and a pay raise considered on the merits of each.

This is not the time to indulge in self-indulgence, to indiscriminately fatten the already well-larded Federal payroll. Our national economy simply cannot afford the luxury of this bill at this time. Therefore, after full and thorough consideration, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for the pending bill.

This bill to which I object proposes a raid on the Public Treasury. Long ago it was written:

> Enter ye the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be who find it.

The gate to the Public Treasury is wide, and broad is the way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I have many times highly commended the Senator from Ohio. I commend him again for his leadership in the Senate in trying to bring an end to conflict-of-interest problems.

Mr. President, I now yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to join the distinguished Senator from Oregon as a cosponsor of his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Thirteen years ago, when I was chairman of the Committee on Ethics in Government, this was the recommendation our committee made. I have tried to follow through with the recommendations of that committee by voluntarily submitting this year a detailed statement of my holdings and income from various sources.

Mr. MORSE. I have always been greatly indebted to the Senator from Illinois for the help that he has given and for the leadership he has extended to the Senate on this issue.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may join the Senator from Oregon as a cosponsor of his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to have the Senator from New Jersey as a cosponsor.

Mr. CASE. What the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] said is, of course, true. We have been less long in the Senate than the Senator from Oregon, but almost as long, in relation to our service, as sponsors of almost indentical bills ourselves.

My own inspiration comes largely from the work done by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] some years ago in connection with the committee which he headed, and which looked into the matter of making recommendations, the key of which was disclosure.

It is clear from both old and modern history in this body that the Senate will not police itself, and there is no outside body adequate to do it. It is necessary to rely on the principle of disclosure. I think it is essential that we adopt it as quickly as possible.

I am happy to join the Senator from Oregon in the offering of his amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield 2 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. With the consent of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that I may be joined as a cosponsor of his amendment.

I feel it is most important that we adopt conflict-of-interest legislation before voting any pay increase for ourselves.

I fully support the amendment of the Senator from Oregon and if it should not succeed, I shall offer my amendment, No. 1092, thereafter, in an effort to at least deal at this time with the problem of outside income and investments for Members of Congress and their staffs.

It is unfortunate that the congressional pay raise provisions have been tied to the proposed pay raises to our postal workers and classified employees.

There is no question as to the merit of these increases for the employees in the postal and civil service. It would be completely false economy to keep their salaries at present levels. This Nation is most fortunate in having the highest caliber of employees in the classified service and the postal system. We cannot expect these talented and dedicated employees to remain in Government service at bargain basement wages.

Pay raises to postal workers and classified employees will not, in my judgment, be inflationary. They are an investment in Government efficiency and morale which will pay rich dividends in improved public service.

Congress has an obligation to live up to the promises of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. We adopted what I consider to be an eminently fair and reasonable approach to the problem by providing that Federal salaries would be as comparable as possible with those paid in private industry for the same type of work.

We are now on the threshold of the first test of this enlightened policy. It is incumbent upon us to prove our good faith to those who have worked for the Federal Government in reliance upon this promise. Postal workers and classified employees have not reneged on their obligation to give an honest day's work for a day's pay. We in turn must not renege on our compensation promises of 1962 to give an honest day's pay in return.

Be it merit, comparability or cost of living increases, these Federal employees who are legally denied some of the means of redress enjoyed by their counterparts in private industry to secure wage increases, deserve fair treatment at this bargaining table. Despite other defects in the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964, there can be no withdrawal from our obligation to approve the reasonable salary increases to the postal and classified employees. I shall, therefore, support the bill.

We have already enacted broad conflict-of-interest legislation applicable to employees in the postal and civil service. What we want to do now is remove any suggestion of a double standard by applying similar obligations to the legislative branch. I commend the Senator from Oregon for his efforts and am pleased to join with him.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New York. I appreciate his support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Oregon. After the Comptroller General received the reports, what would be done with them? Would they be reported back to the Senate, or would they be made public?

Mr. MORSE. They would be published as a public document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does someone yield time to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be happy to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. MILLER. I invite the Senator's attention to the limitations on disclosure in his amendment.

I am wondering whether the Senator's amendment really would get the job

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

done. With respect to page 2, the first subsection, what about cases; an individual's spouse or his children, or his brothers or sisters, or his parents, or a trust over which he has control, of which he is the beneficiary?

Mr. MORSE. I understand the problem; we have discussed it many times. This is a good start. I am for going this far now.

Mr. MILLER. I wonder if the Senator would agree to expand the coverage.

Mr. MORSE. Not at this time. We will do that next year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. How much time does the Senator from Montana wish?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment, not that I am not in accord with it, because I am. The fact is, the distinguished Senator from Oregon is the "granddaddy" of all these bills, although many others get credit for what he started about 18 years ago. It was his inspiration while I was a Member of the House which caused me to introduce similar legislation in that body. I believe that I have introduced bills of that nature in the Senate as well.

I believe I made a public statement that I have no outside interests; I am not engaged in dealing in any properties. The only income I receive is on the basis of my service in this body.

I point out to Senators that there is a resolution now on the calendar, Senate Resolution 337, reported by the Rules Committee, which may not go so far as some Senators wish, but I believe that I am correct in stating that there will be amendments to the resolution when it is reported to the floor.

I assure Senators that Senate Resolution 337 will come up in the Senate, and enough time can be taken to discuss the subject so that all facets of it can be explored.

I do not believe that this is an appropriate bill to which to attach this amendment. I believe more in the way of discussion is needed, and will be forthcoming. I would hope, therefore, that on the basis of the promise made that the resolution will come up—and it was going to come up, any way; it will be subject to amendments—the proposal will not be accepted at this time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator agree that the really substantial difference between the Morse amendment and Senate Resolution 337, which was started as the result of the Bobby Baker investigation, is that the Morse amendment deals not only with the Senate, but also with the House, the executive arm of the Government and the armed services, requiring reporting by the Comptroller General. Therefore it is a comprehensive disclosure amendment; whereas, the Bobby Baker resolution—if I may call it that—to which my friend the Senator from Montana refers, is confined strictly to the operations of the Senate, and it would be difficult, indeed, by appropriate amendment, to expand and take care of the other body and the executive arm.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Difficult, but not impossible; and what the Senator has said otherwise is correct.

But, I would hope that the Senate would spend more time on this most important subject. I repeat, the "granddaddy" of all those who have introduced amendments of this kind is the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I wonder whether we could inquire at this time whether Senate Resolution 337 is technically subject to amendment by the provision of the Morse amendment or similar legislation. It is a Senate resolution as opposed to a bill, which the Senator's amendment really is.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest, on my time, that the Senator make inquiry of the Chair on that point.

Mr. CASE. May I inquire of the Parliamentarian, through the courtesy of the majority leader, whether Senate Resolution 337, when it comes to the floor, could be subject to amendment by offering it either as an amendment or a substitute to the provisions of the Morse amendment now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that legislative amendments would not be in order on the resolution.

Mr. CASE. So, the Morse amendment would not be in order as an amendment to Senate Resolution 337?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was brought out by the Senator from Pennsylvania in his colloquy earlier. But, amendments would be in order——

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is is not a fact that the report of the Rules Committee and the bill they have reported, being a mere resolution of the Senate, would not be subject to amendment involving the House. It would have to be changed to a Senate resolution in order to effectuate that, which would merely mean a reintroduction of any amendment that could offer an opportunity to both Houses to work their will on legislation specifically dealing with this most important subject.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. There is a good deal of merit in this kind of resolution because of its genesis. It applies primarily only because of the incident which brought about the inquiry and, therefore, it may be a good place to start.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, this amendment, and similar amendments, to me, seem to be——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired. Who yields time to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield the time?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not wish to take more than a couple of minutes.

I am against this resolution. I am against all resolutions of this kind, because it is pretended that they are surrounded by an atmosphere of alleged righteousness. I do not believe they are.

I have seen many self-righteous declarations of affluence, or lack of affluence, filed by persons involved in public life. With the exception of one or two, they are not detailed, they are not informative, and they do not disclose the facts; yet, they fly under the banner of disclosure.

I am completely disgusted with the claim that some of these things have met the test of disclosure, of affluence, of property rights.

Mr. President, so far as I personally am concerned, I probably am about the least affluent Member of this body. I do not own one share of stock. I do not own any bonds, except a very few Government bonds which I have managed to "scratch out" once in a while. I have not been able to accumulate any property which amounts to anything in approximately 34 years of public life, except that my house is paid for, and perhaps I have a few dollars in the bank.

Probably one of the reasons why I might be opposed to this amendment is that I am ashamed to tell the truth that in my lifetime I have not become more affluent than I have. I have not done a single thing to be ashamed of. If any Senators wish to come and look at my assets, they are welcome to come and look at them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator refers to his disgust at some who have undertaken to reveal their assets on the floor of the Senate.

Let me ask this question, as one who did: Did the Senator refer to me and to the others who did so, and is he remaining within the confines of rule XIX, section 2?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I did not express disgust with people. I expressed disgust with the form of the alleged disclosure that occurred in a number of cases in public life.

I said that I did not confine my remarks to this body, or to any other body. There have been many occasions before

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

committees on which people have disclosed assets in a manner which I believe does not meet the test of full disclosure. My remarks were made in general.

Mr. CLARK. I take it that the Senator does not refer to any Senator; therefore, I am happy to accept his apology.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator may interpret my remarks any way he wishes. I made my remarks generally about people in public life. I have not circumscribed it or limited it.

Again I say that so far as I am personally concerned I probably could be charged with being a little ashamed of the fact that during my lifetime, which has largely been spent in public office, I have failed to accumulate any great amount of this world's goods.

I will say, furthermore, that I have never inherited a dollar in my life, so whatever I do not have is because I do not have it based on my own efforts.

In a way, this creates a special aura of demagoguery. I do not think Senators of the United States, or any respectable citizens in the country should be forced to engage in a full disclosure of all his private affairs, business or otherwise. The people of his State pass on those things. They are the ones that judge the propriety or lack of propriety in his election. If any Member is guilty of shortcomings, maladministration of his office, or anything else, this body had the right to kick him out. This body has the right to police itself now.

We have gone through some hearings which I think failed to go into many things that should have been gone into.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But I think this particular proposal and this series of proposals do not merit support. They are singling out special groups for special odium.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They are singling out for special odium or special consideration a certain group of people who should deserve the consideration of the respect given them by the voters of their State when they were sent here. If they have done wrong, let them be punished in the orderly way. If they violate the responsibility, the honor, and the dignity of this great office, let the Senate act on those particular occasions.

From my standpoint, I have no hesitancy in saying that any Senator who wants to come and look at what I have is welcome to do it. And I will apologize because of my lack of ability to establish, create, and accumulate affluence during the period of my public life.

I have nothing to conceal. But it is a matter of basic principle. I am not going to vote to have every businessman of this country disclose his assets, or all of his reports on income tax, either. We have had a policy along that line for a long time. I do not think it is good legislation. I think it is belittling legislation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MILLER. Is the amendment of the Senator from Oregon open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Sentaor from Oregon is open to amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Presldent, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state it for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. MILLER proposes an amendment to the Morse amendment. On page 2, strike the semicolon in line 8 and insert the following: ", by his spouse, children and their spouses, brothers and sisters, father and mother, and any trust or fiduciary arrangement under which any of said individuals is a beneficiary or over which he or she exerts any control: *Provided*, That if said Member, officer, or employee is unable to file any information required hereby with respect to any of the individuals or entities specified, other than his spouse and minor children, because of their refusal to provide such information, he shall file a statement, under oath, setting forth the name and relationship and the fact of such refusal."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. I yield myself such time as I require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that while the amendment he proposes has the semblance of merit to it, it does not go far enough. I do not think that the general public will be fooled one little bit.

We all know that if one wants to avoid or evade some of the purposes that are set forth in the Senator's amendment, that this can readily be done through the vehicle of using one's spouse, one's children, father, mother, brother, or sister, or a trust, or the establishment of a fiduciary arrangement.

Let us do a job if we are going to do a job. I do not think we ought to say, "We will do it tomorrow, or next year." If we are going to do it, now is the time. I do not think we are going to raise the stature of the Senate or of Congress one bit by the adoption of an amendment which goes only as far as the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. But if we are willing to couple with it various individuals who, as a matter of common knowledge, are tied in with people who want to cover up—then I think we can get a job done that will cause the general public to have confidence in the integrity of those we are trying to cover by this measure. If we do not do it, I think we are going to be attempting to fool them. And I do not think they are going to be fooled, either.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is not necessary to have the amendment of the Senator from Iowa in order to accomplish the purpose sought by the Senator from Iowa. My amendment would require disclosure of income tax returns of public officials and public employees that fall within the category stated. If we obtain that disclosure, that is all we need.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I agree that the Senator from Oregon is the father of all resolutions requiring disclosure. I remember that in 1947 he was advocating disclosure. Nonetheless, I shall vote against this amendment.

I should like to give my reasons. I was a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration when we investigated the Baker matter for months. At the end of our rather futile investigation, we took up the question of disclosure resolutions. One was voted out and is now on the calendar.

Senator CLARK introduced a substitute which, in my opinion, is a more effective resolution that the one reported. I voted for the Clark resolution. Senator MANSFIELD has said that the committee resolution will come before the Senate. We shall have an opportunity to vote on it, the Clark resolution, the Case resolution, the Morse resolution, and others. There can be a thorough discussion.

The reason I shall vote against the pending amendment is, with all due deference to my colleague, whom I admire for his leadership in the disclosure field, is first, that it has no chance of acceptance by the House.

We are trying to tell the House of Representatives what its rules should be. We know the conferees are not going to accept this. The resolution applies to every employee of the United States making over $10,000 annually. I think we should consider whether we want to make every such employee in the United States subject to this drastic procedure.

Let us clean our own house and provide a rule of disclosure for the Senate. I will vote for it. My disclosure would be about like Senator HICKENLOOPER'S.

Let us act here, and do something that would apply to the Senate first, instead of trying to apply a rule to all empolyees in the United States.

By voting, a Senator can say that he is in favor of disclosure. I will vote for a disclosure resolution when I have a chance to vote for one that would be meaningful.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me 1 minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CANNON. I concur in what the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has said. The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has reported a resolution to the Senate, and the resolution will be considered. In

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

general, with a few exceptions, I support the terms of the amendment. I have drafted and propose to introduce at a later date a bill directed toward the very end sought, with some minor changes, in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon. But there will be an opportunity to consider the resolution covering the Senate itself. If we were to enact an amendment of the type proposed, we would really sound the death knell for the pay bill at this particular time for many who are entitled to pay consideration. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. I do not wish to prolong the discussion. I merely wish to repeat that if we really wish to do a job in this connection, the Morse amendment would not do it. It would not go far enough. We know it does not go far enough, and the people will know that it does not go far enough. Other categories of individuals who have close personal relationship with the Member of Congress, the officer, or the employee, must be covered. Make no mistake about it. We shall not raise the prestige of our body in the eyes of the American people by limiting the coverage as the Morse amendment would do.

The Senator from Oregon has said that it is not necessary. We know it is necessary. There are ample instances in which people have covered up some of their financial transactions by using their spouses, their children, their parents, their brothers or sisters, or have entered into some fiduciary arrangement.

All my amendment would do is to make sure that we do an adequate job of coverage. If the Senate does not think that this is the time to deal with such a problem as this—and personally, I do not believe it is—Senators may vote against the Morse amendment, as amended by the pending amendment. But if Senators think they are going to fool the American people by voting the amendment down, and then voting for the Morse amendment, I believe it will be a very unfortunate and unhappy experience.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me 1 minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 minute to the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To the best of my knowledge, no Member of this body is trying to fool the American people. I believe that we are sent here to exercise our judgment in the best way we know how. If anyone has the idea that because we vote for or against a certain amendment or an amendment to an amendment that we are trying to fool the American people, I wish he would disabuse his mind of the idea, because that is a mark against the Senate as an institution and against Senators individually.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate what the majority leader and the minority leader have said. The bill deals with the pay scales of approximately 1,732,000 Government employees. It has been before the Congress last year and this year. It is up today for final passage.

I believe that we should have disclosure. The work that has been done in the investigating committees by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and by others will produce and give us a genuine and proper disclosure bill when the time comes, and we shall have an opportunity to take up the question as we should in a full day, 2 days, or 3 days, if necessary, in an attempt to find proper means and methods to have a very tight disclosure system for the Senate, for the House, or for both.

But I am now telling the Senate that, knowing the House conferees as we do, if the amendment is put in the bill as a Senate amendment which would include the House, we shall have very great trouble saving the bill, because the historic comity between the Houses of Congress permits each House to be the judge of its own rules.

The proposal in effect would be a rule that the Senate would like to vote upon itself for disclosure of whatever income we may have. I think most of us are for it. I certainly am. I am only ashamed that it cannot be enough to seem important. But the House would resent it and probably break up the conference if we included it in a rule that we properly believe should be a part of the operations of the Senate. We are two individually distinct and independent bodies. Throughout history one body has not tried to impose its opinions or morals on the other body. We have got into some very important fights, as Senators well know, over such subjects as the use of the frank. Each body claimed it had the right to determine the question for itself.

It is for that reason, at this late hour, with 15 minutes on a side, that I say it is a poor time to rush into proposed legislation of so great importance. If the subject is brought up in the right way as a bill, doing that one thing, it would undoubtedly receive the unanimous or nearly unanimous support of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to have 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield my remaining time to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes under the bill

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It seems to me that we are living in an age of snoopers. We are now proposing to enlarge the field in this very body. I think it is time to come to grips with the problem and to assert our rights, because the fact that one is in public service certainly does not divest him of his rights as a citizen of the United States. If it is desired to tack up every income tax blank on every courthouse door in the country and put us all on a par, that is a different thing. But it is proposed to require every Member of this body file three reports a year. First, a report with respect to such things as resources and income would be filed with the Comptroller. Section 2 would require the filing, semiannually with the Comptroller, of a report containing a full and complete statement of all dealings in securities.

If a Senator should buy one share of stock, he must make a return to the Comptroller of the United States. If he buys another share in the next 6 months, he must make another report.

The amendment would make bookkeepers out of Senators, and they would have scant time left to pursue their duties as Members of the U.S. Senate.

My distinguished friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] began by saying that he was somehow impressed with the fact that the Members of this body were honorable. I agree with him. But the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] rose to mention the fact that although we were honorable Members, we had to be policed.

Mr. President, I do not go in for such policing operations. If I cannot go back and justify my conduct with the people back home, where candidates for office are screened, I have no business being here in the first place. We would cover a large segment of the Government, including every Representative, every Senator, and every employee in this entire governmental establishment who receives $10,000 or more. Everyone over the rating of GS–15 would be within the reporting requirement. Every Army officer over the grade of colonel would be included, as well as all the generals. That is what the Morse amendment would do. The Senator from Oregon shakes his head affirmatively.

Finally members of the national committees would be included. How they got in I do not know. They are not officials of the Government.

The proposal has about it the old prohibition aura. How did it start? There is a large building over here that attests what finally happened. There were those who said, in the language of the Book:

> Wine is a mocker, strong drink a brawler.

We heard, "Alcohol is a curse. It must be stopped. I am pure, holy, and undefiled. No alcohol has ever seeped through my lips. But that is not enough. Somehow, I have to save others and make sure they are holy, purified, and righteous, too." Everybody becomes a crusader.

That crusade mounted to proportions that finally put the 18th amendment into the Constitution of the United States. I is the one amendment that was contrary to the spirit of that document. What does the Bill of Rights provide? It provides that Congress shall make no laws abridging freedoms, and so forth. But when we got to the 18th amendment, we said, not that the Congress shall not, but that the people shall not. They shall not manufacture. They shall not trans-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

port. They shall not import. They shall not drink. We added the implementation of the Volstead Act. Then the snoopers went over the country. What an amazing thing.

My friend from Iowa spoke a moment ago about the image of the Senate. I remember a very distinguished rabbi, whose name was Joshua Liebman. I remember when he offered the invocation in the House of Representatives. He wrote a book called "Peace of Mind." Walking down LaSalle Street in Chicago one time, I saw the book in the window, and I picked up a copy. In the first chapter there was the challenging statement that "You cannot reconstruct society on the basis of unreconstructed individuals."

The image of the U.S. Senate will take care of itself. Just be sure that our own images are correct and that they are not under compulsion. What is an image worth if it is under compulsion of a law? No; the Senate image will be all right if we guard our individual conduct.

To pass something such as is here proposed is somewhat of a confession that there must be some dishonor here, although we start by saying that every Member of this body is honorable.

For the life of me, I cannot understand the logic that goes with it. I am not going to vote to police another Member of this body. Every Senator is free to make a statement of his assets, liabilities, and income, and put it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He can see that his income tax return is published in the RECORD, if he wants to do it. But why should one have to do it? Why does another person become my moral mentor because I refuse to do it under that kind of compulsion? Congress does not give the Internal Revenue Service the right to publicize the return of anyone. Any individual Member of Congress can publicize it, himself, and put it in the RECORD. But that is not enough for some. They say, "I am righteous, I am holy, I am undefiled, I am pure in spirit, I am honorable. But I must make my neighbor in the same image, and I must compel him to come up to the line."

Look out, for when we start moving that way, we are going in a dangerous direction.

Mr. President, there has been much snoopery in this country. God willing, it will never happen again.

Why do we point the finger of scorn at countries behind the Iron Curtain? Because the people in those countries are afraid of the knock on the door at midnight. Because they are afraid of wiretapping. Because they are afraid of snooping. Because they are afraid of talking.

Committee after committee of Congress has undertaken to run down espionage and spying in our own country. It is proposed now to get into the swim and spirit of that, and to say, "We have to put a mantle upon our fellow Members," as if it were not enough to have individual Members do it.

Let any man stand in his place; if he wants to do it, he is free to do it. There is nothing in the law to inhibit him.

It is like the pay bill. I do not know of anything to inhibit a Senator from introducing a bill to give back a pay increase. All he has to do is authorize the Treasury to take it. Until it is done, it cannot go back to the Treasury. The Treasury does not have authority to take any money except what goes anonymously into the conscience fund.

This is the worst thing the Senate could do, and it would be a tortuous path from here on out. It certainly will not be consummated by my vote.

The Miller amendment, the Morse amendment, the Keating amendment, the Clark amendment—all of them should be voted down by an overwhelming vote. Let us show the country that, in our own image, we will do the honorable thing. Then, if the image of this institution must be retrieved, it will be done, and not before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator take 2 minutes on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. From whose side is the time to be taken?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. President, I end where I started, with the statement by that eloquent rabbi who died at the age of 84, when he said, "You do not reconstruct a society on the basis of unreconstructed individuals." That is where we start, and I am not worrying about the image of the Senate. Let each Member worry for himself, and not undertake to exercise the power of compulsion to have others report and report and report, in order to retrieve an image, if one confesses that that image is tarnished. I make no such confession.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

I shall be proud to go back home and stand on any platform and let any one of the 10½ million people, young or old, in the State of Illinois ask me, "Do you want now to tell us what you own, what your resources are?" I shall say, "I will tell you the day that every other taxpaying citizen in the country makes an equal disclosure. I am not a class B citizen."

Mr. President, I yield back whatever time I have remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 minutes on the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I cannot subscribe to either the Miller amendment or the Morse amendment. If I have to file an affidavit to prove that I am honest, then I am practically morally bankrupt. I have been in public life for 30 years. I am a lawyer. Ever since I left the bench I have not had a law office. I have nothing to hide. I have not had any $100 plate dinners for me. I refuse to receive contributions for my campaign from individuals who do business with government.

I know within myself what the status of my conscience is.

If this proposal is to be made, why not propose that everybody's income tax report should be available for examination? I think this is a situation that cannot be justified. Why should I be presumed to be dishonest? Why will not my honesty be established until I file an affidavit?

I wish to repeat that if I am in that condition, I should abandon public office and drop my head in shame.

I have never filed an affidavit. I did make a disclosure of my assets when a newspaper columnist charged me, erroneously, about a matter. He subsequently withdrew and retracted his charges.

I cannot vote for the proposal, not because I fear to disclose. I think I could disclose with much greater ease and propriety than many of those who are supporting the proposal.

In my whole lifetime, except for that one attack made here in Washington 4 years ago, my integrity has never been challenged.

My life is my affidavit. My life is my proof. The people know it. After 30 years of service, in 1962 the people of Ohio elected me by 700,000 votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That was the highest majority ever given a candidate. I did not have to file any affidavit to prove my honesty.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I oppose the Morse amendment and all similar amendments. They are not in the public interest. As to Senators, I doubt if there is any State in the Union in which voters cannot ascertain for themselves who is engaged in the production of a supported crop, who is engaged in manufacturing, who has interests in banking, and so on.

The amendment affects a great many other people. It affects every member of the armed forces of the rank of colonel and above. It affects the fine men and women in Senators' offices, if they receive more than $10,000 a year.

What does it require them to do? It requires them to file a report twice a year. What must they show? They must show how much money they owe. That is what we would do to the people who work for us. The amendment includes even the mothers of our armed services people who are fighting in Vietnam. They would become criminals if they did not file a report twich a year, showing whether or not someone gave them as much as $100, or the amount of each liability owed by them.

How ridiculous can we become?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Whom does it cover? It covers the Armed Forces, and it covers the people who work in our offices.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have had something to do with certain investigations. It is my honest belief that the amendment would not do one thing to stop corruption. A small minority,

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

whether elected or appointed to office, are corrupt, follow secret and devious means, and make false reports, concealing their assets. They use a third person to hold their assets.

The amendment will not end or deter corruption.

The amendment would be a blow at the good people who work for the Government. It is harassment of the honest and conscientious. It is unfair and unjust.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it seems to me that this amendment proposes an ex post facto law. The Constitution of the United States sets forth the conditions under which a man may be elected to the Senate. He must be 30 years of age, and on the day of his election he must reside in the State. The persons who have run for election to the Senate under those conditions were not required to make the kind of disclosure that the amendment would require. If the supporters of the disclosure idea would like to offer a constitutional amendment, setting forth the type of disclosure Senators must make if they are elected to the Senate, let the Senate, the House, and the States of the Union decide whether such disclosure is necessary. Then I believe we would be approaching the problem properly.

People who take jobs in the executive department know in advance whether they will be required either to disclose or divest, and that fact may influence their decision to take the job.

My friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], is a great constitutional lawyer. I am surprised that he has not realized that the constitutional amendment processes are really the only sound basis on which to approach this kind of problem.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah could not be more wrong as a matter of constitutional law than the fallacious argument he has just made.

Mr. BENNETT. I will leave it to my colleagues in the Senate to decide that question.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, all that my amendment would do, so far as my friend from Illinois and my friend from Ohio are concerned, would be to put the Morse amendment into shape so that if perchance it were adopted we would not have to hang our heads and admit that we were not doing a job.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. With respect to my friend from Nebraska, all that my amendment would do would be to put into the Morse amendment the third parties to which he referred in his statement. Covering the mother of an officer and forgetting the third parties, so far as I am concerned, is a once-over-lightly, superficial approach. People would know it to be so. What I am trying to do with my amendment is to put the Morse amendment into shape so that if it should be adopted, the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Ohio, who would vote against the amendment anyhow, at least would realize that we had not done a superficial job.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator's amendment is adopted and if the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is adopted, is it not true that the brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers of every colonel fighting in Vietnam will have to file a report or be guilty of being a criminal?

Mr. MILLER. If my amendment were adopted I would hope that we would have some further amendments to the Morse amendment adopted.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not asking the Senator about his hopes. Is that not what would happen if the two amendments were adopted?

Mr. MILLER. And nothing more; yes. But that does not meet the actualities of the situation.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to ask the Senator about one further situation. Suppose a lady worked in this building and her gross income, which means before expenses and before deductions for dependents, was $10,000. The adoption of the Senator's amendment would require a financial statement to be filed by her showing all gifts of $100 or more, and it would require a showing on her part of all of her debts, and a similar report of her brothers and sisters and her mother and her father. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER. No; that is not correct. The Senator has not read my amendment. It relates only to the first subparagraph on page 2. What the Senator is talking about is the second and, I believe, the third paragraphs on page 2.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator's amendment applies to everyone covered by the bill.

Mr. MILLER. It relates only to the first subsection on page 2.

Mr. CURTIS. That would include the people involved.

Mr. MILLER. It does not include debts at all. It includes income and gifts.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator would require brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers and everybody with a gross income of $10,000 to file the report. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER. It would require an official to file a statement. I should like to clear this up for the Senator from Nebraska by asking the clerk to read the proviso clause of my amendment, because I wish him to understand that we are not being unreasonable.

Will the clerk read beginning with the proviso?

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Provided, That if said Member, officer, or employee is unable to file any information required hereby with respect to any of the individuals or entities specified, other than his spouse and minor children, because of their refusal to provide such information, he shall file a statement, under oath setting forth the name and relationship and the fact of such refusal.

Mr. MILLER. What is so unreasonable about that?

Mr. CURTIS. It is very unreasonable. It does not deter dishonesty. It harasses the innocent. It does not touch the people who proceed in a devious and secret manner. That is where the corruption comes.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Iowa usually see eye to eye on things of this type. A few minutes ago, he criticized the failure to cover the very persons that my amendment covers, the very persons he thinks ought to be covered.

Mr. CURTIS. No; the Senator places impositions on relatives with respect to filing reports when there is no evidence whatever of dishonesty, even on the part of the principals.

Mr. MILLER. I do not wish to labor the point. The Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Illinois, and other Senators know that if one wants to be devious, the Morse amendment will not handle the situation at all. If my amendment were adopted, it would be possible to touch base with those people who are in such close and intimate relationship with those individuals. This is the way to catch up with the deviousness.

If Senators want to take the risk of having the Morse amendment adopted, an amendment, which, as I said, is superficial, and is an empty gesture, they can reject my amendment. They can still vote for my amendment and then vote against the Morse amendment, as amended.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MILLER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Oregon has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, after listening to this interesting argument, I merely say that those who would be covered are servants of the people. The people are entitled to know the facts about the subject covered by the amendment.

I am more convinced than ever that it is in the public interest to proceed as I propose.

I yield back the rest of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay" and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 66, as follows:

[No. 462 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Case	Keating	Pastore
Church	Kuchel	Proxmire
Clark	Magnuson	Smith
Douglas	McGee	Symington
Gore	McGovern	Thurmond
Hart	Morse	Williams, N.J.
Hartke	Moss	Young, Ohio
Jackson	Nelson	
Javits	Neuberger	

NAYS—66

Aiken	Ervin	Metcalf
Allott	Fulbright	Miller
Anderson	Goldwater	Monroney
Bartlett	Gruening	Morton
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Pearson
Boggs	Holland	Pell
Brewster	Hruska	Prouty
Burdick	Humphrey	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Robertson
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Cooper	Lausche	Simpson
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Dirksen	Long, La.	Stennis
Dodd	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dominick	McClellan	Tower
Eastland	McIntyre	Walters
Edmondson	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Mechem	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—9

Bayh	Fong	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kennedy	Smathers
Engle	McCarthy	Yarborough

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1089 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 157, in the table following line 21, strike out:

Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$25,000
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent	21,000

and insert in lieu thereof:

Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$26,000
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent	22,000

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. This amendment seeks to increase the salary of the Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia from $25,000 to $26,000, and for the Deputy Superintendent from $21,000 to $22,000. My amendment raises the salary of these two officials to the figure contained in the House-passed bill.

I have this amendment and another one immediately following, which can be disposed of quickly on the basis of the understanding I have with the chairman of the committee. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] tells me that it will go to conference, anyway. He desires the maximum flexibility in conference and he is not opposed to it, as I understand, but I do not seek to bind the committee in conference.

He gives me the assurance that the committee will be in conference, and the amendment will receive very careful consideration of the Senate conferees; but I should like to have him make a brief statement on the floor of the Senate as to his position.

Mr. JOHNSTON. This amendment will go to conference. The Senate figure is $1,000 lower than that of the House. The House gave $26,000 and the Senate gave $25,000, so that will go to conference. Regarding the Deputy Superintendent of Education, the House figure is $22,000 and the Senate figure is $21,000, so that item will also go to conference.

I appreciate the Senator's taking this matter up at this time, to let us decide that matter in conference.

Mr. MORSE. On the basis of my conversation with the Senator from South Carolina, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon is withdrawn.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table showing the amount and rank of salaries currently paid to superintendents of schools, 1962–63.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMOUNT AND RANK OF SALARIES CURRENTLY PAID TO SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS, 1962–63

Cities over 500,000 in population		
1.	Chicago	$48,500
2.	New York	37,500
3.	Los Angeles	35,000
4.	Detroit	33,000
5.	Dallas	33,000
6.	San Francisco	31,000
7.	Pittsburgh	30,000
8.	San Diego	29,400
9.	Philadelphia	27,500
10.	Houston	27,500
11.	Milwaukee	$27,000
12.	Baltimore	25,000
13.	St. Louis	25,000
14.	Boston	25,000
15.	San Antonio	25,000
16.	Seattle	24,000
17.	Buffalo	24,000
18.	Cincinnati	24,000
19.	Cleveland	23,000
20.	New Orleans	21,000
21.	Washington	19,000
Suburban systems		
1.	Montgomery County	$23,000
2.	Arlington County	21,500
3.	Prince Georges County	21,000
4.	Alexandria	20,000
5.	Fairfax County	20,000
6.	Washington	19,000
7.	Falls Church	12,100

Prepared by Department of General Research, Budget, and Legislation, Feb. 12, 1963.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment No. 1090 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 118, after line 25, insert the following——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 118, after line 25, insert the following:

"(26) Chairman, National Mediation Board.

"(27) Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board."

On page 119, renumber items (26) to (33) as (28) to (35), respectively.

On page 119, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

"(36) Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service."

On page 119, renumber items (34) to (40) as (37) to (43), respectively.

On page 121, strike out lines 12 and 13.

On page 121, renumber items (27) to (32) as (25) to (30), respectively.

On page 122, strike out lines 1 and 2.

On pages 122, 123, and 124 renumber items (34) to (68), inclusive, as items (31) to (65), respectively.

On page 124, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"(66) Members, National Mediation Board.

"(67) Members, Railroad Retirement Board."

On page 124, renumber items (69) to (71) as (68) to (70), respectively.

On page 132, strike out lines 6 and 7.

On page 132, renumber items (93) to (97) as (91) to (95), respectively.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this amendment proposes to eliminate the unwarranted distinctions in grade level drawn by the bill between the agencies of the Federal Government immediately concerned with the administration of the national labor policy. These agencies have historically and traditionally been equal rank with equal compensation and under my amendment this parity of treatment would be maintained.

Section 303(c)(25) of the bill recognizes that the Chairman of the National

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Labor Relations Board performs a function equal in significance to that performed by the chairmen of other commissions, such as the Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Security and Exchange Commission. The chairmen of these agencies are placed on a parity with the Deputy Attorney General and the Solicitor General of the United States and with the various Under Secretaries of the Departments.

This is as it should be.

These key officials in the executive branch of the Federal Government have been placed in level III of the Federal executive salary schedule and, if this bill is enacted, will receive basic compensation at $28,500 per year.

However, section 303(d)(25) of the bill, for some purpose which is not altogether clear to me, downgrades the Chairman of the National Mediation Board to the next lower level of the Federal executive salary schedule, carrying an annual rate of basic compensation at $27,000 per year, or $1,500 less than his counterpart on the National Labor Relations Board.

Section 303(d)(26) of the bill provides for the similar downgrading of the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board.

I now turn to section 303(d)(33) of the bill and find that the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has been given the same treatment. He, too, is considered to be somewhat inferior to the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board and has been relegated to level 4 in the pay scale.

I have no quarrel with the judgment of the committee in identifying the National Labor Relations Board as a grade A agency and rewarding its Chairman with the level 3 scale of compensation. Throughout most of my professional life, I have been intimately acquainted with the nature of the work of this Board, and I think that it is fair to say that I understand its function as well as any other Member of Congress. In my judgment, the Labor Board plays a most significant role in the administration of the national labor policy and throughout the greater part of its 28-year history has played this role well. I may say that during the course of the past 3 or 4 years, it has played this role substantially better than in the period immediately preceding that point of time. Indeed, many of us are well acquainted with Chairman of the Labor Board, Frank McCullough, from his years of devoted and outstanding work in the Senate, and I can say without reservations that Chairman McCullough's outstanding service on the Board entitles him to every cent of the compensation proposed by this bill. However, it is not my intention to personalize this aspect of the pay bill, nor should it be. Our concern is with the function and not with the incumbent performing that function.

But the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board plays only one of a number of the roles performed by the executive branch in the administration of the national labor policy. Of no less importance is the role played by the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

Indeed, in one sense, the Director of the Mediation Service is positioned in the very center of the system through which the national labor policy is administered. I need not remind you that this policy for the past quarter century has been the encouragement, promotion, and preservation of a system of free and voluntary collective bargaining. We recognized long ago that free collective bargaining was an indispensable element of an economic democracy. Reaffirmation and rededication to this policy becomes increasingly important in this period of our history, faced as we are by unparalleled tensions in the world about us.

Free collective bargaining means, of course, the development of policies and procedures to insure that labor and management remain free to arrive at voluntary solutions of their problems. The development and improvement of methods to enable the parties to work out their differences and to arrive at voluntary agreements which are compatible with the interests of the community as a whole without work stoppages is a necessary corollary to the basic national policy of promoting and encouraging free and voluntary collective bargaining.

It is at this central point in the administration of the national labor policy that the Mediation Service plays its role. It operates as the yeast, the catalyst, the peacemaker, the directional finder, the midwife—call it what you will—in assisting the parties in defining the precise points of their differences and in identifying the common ground upon which reconciliation may be found.

This is the process by which the parties are aided and encouraged to rely upon reasoning and persuasion in arriving at good faith resolutions of their disputes and, at times, in dissipating the fog of suspicion that may otherwise obscure the field markers outlining the area upon which agreement may be found.

Of course, in the nature of things, the work of the Mediation Service must proceed quietly, anonymously, and without publicity. But its contribution in the 17 years of its existence to the development of rational and effective labor-management relations policies, in promoting and preserving free collective bargaining and in maintaining industrial peace has been invaluable.

Let us examine its record. It receives 100,000 notices under section (8)(d) of the National Labor Relations Act each year covering all cases within the scope of the act in which it is proposed to modify collective bargaining agreements on contract termination or otherwise.

Twenty thousand of these cases are assigned to Federal mediators.

In 7,000 cases the mediator moves directly into the dispute. The period of joint meetings may range from a single meeting to as many as 80 or more in the complex and difficult cases. On the average, four meetings are required in each case.

The principal objective of the Mediation Service is to provide useful and meaningful service to the parties in assisting them to arrive at voluntary solutions to the disputes without work stoppages. Thus, the maintenance of industrial peace is, in a very real sense, the measure of the success of the Service. If we look at the record, we will find that during the past 4 or 5 years strikes have been at an alltime low, ranging from fourteen one-hundredths of 1 percent to seventeen one-hundredths of 1 percent of man-hours lost compared to total man-hours work.

Most of us will agree, I am sure, that we do not want the Federal Government or the State government meddling or intervening into labor relations. We know that compulsory arbitration means the ends of free collective bargaining. We also know that the various forms of governmental regulations of labor relations short of arbitration inhibit and eventually undermine the freedom of choice in this area which is so essential to the preservation of our system of government.

The key factor in the prevention of inroads and invasions by the Government into this precious institution of free collective bargaining is the mediation function. The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service performs this function extraordinarily well and I challenge anyone to deny that its contribution to the maintenance of the national labor policy is one iota less important than that of the National Labor Relations Board.

If the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board belongs in level III of the Federal executive salary schedule, so does the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

I should emphasize at this point in my remarks that these officers are now rated on the same scale of magnitude.

When the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service was created as a result of the incorporation of my bill into the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 the compensation of the Director was fixed at precisely the same level as the compensation of the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

Some years later on July 31, 1956, when these salaries were adjusted the two offices continued to be recognized as having equal magnitude. The Director's salary, like the Chairman's salary, was raised to $20,500.

And so it is today. These men are treated in the same way under the Classification Act.

There is not the slightest justification for making a distinction between the importance of these jobs at this time.

Indeed, if anything, it is more important than ever to underscore the essential nature of the work of the Mediation Service. The administration has recognized this and has made efforts to raise the professional status of the Federal Mediation staff in order to permit it to function more effectively. This policy of the administration was cited with approval by the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy in its report of a few years ago.

My amendment would maintain the equal status which has traditionally and

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

historically been accorded to these two offices. Each should be established within level III of the salary schedule as my amendment proposes.

A third element in the execution of the national labor policy is the National Mediation Board which performs for the railroad and airline industries precisely the same function that the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service performs for the rest of the economy.

In examining the pay bill, I find that the chairman of the National Mediation Board has been downgraded in the same manner as has the Director of the Federal Mediation Service. The remarks which I have made thus far, apply with equal force to the National Mediation Board.

The National Mediation Board has the responsibility for the administration of the Railway Labor Act. This Board over a period of some, almost 30 years has maintained a unique record for the preservatio nof the stability of labor management relations in this field. In addition the National Mediation Board has the responsibility, under the state statute, for labor management relations among carriers by air and their employees.

In this relatively new field of burgeoning employment, now exceeding 500,000 employees, the Board's record over the past 25 years has been equally successful. The maintenance of the flow of commerce along these vital arteries requires the highest degree of responsibility and application by the members of this Board. In addition its agents and employees are in constant touch with the leaders of labor and management in these fields on almost a daily basis to prevent a disruption in the flow of interstate commerce. The National Mediation Board has the additional responsibility of administering the affairs and budget of the National Railroad Adjustment Board in Chicago. This latter agency faces the task of adjusting thousands of minor disputes during the course of each year. In all, the stability of the employment relationship of over a million and a quarter wage earners in the United States are affected by the operations of the National Mediation Board.

Thus, my amendment proposes to restore the balance between these various functions which has been recognized for so long and which reflects the actual facts. The Chairman of the National Mediation Board, like the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board and the Director of the Federal Mediation Service should be placed in level 3.

Next, we come to the Railroad Retirement Board. Here again, for some reason, the committee has downgraded the chairman of this Board to the level 4 category. He, too, has historically and traditionally been recognized as performing a function, equal in status and worth to that of the other officials whom I have described above.

The railroad retirement system provides important protection to railroad employees, their dependents and survivors. The railroad unemployment insurance system provides nationwide unemployment and sickness protection for railroad employees.

The Railroad Retirement Board employs about 2,000 employees. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the Railroad Retirement Board paid more than $1,200 million in benefits to 1,200,000 beneficiaries under the two systems. The total amount paid out by the Board through fiscal 1963 is about $14 billion.

The Railroad Retirement Board has an excellent record of performance in the administration of the two systems, and I feel very strongly that, considering the importance, responsibility and size of the systems the Board administers, the downgrading of this agency which the bill proposes is clearly unwarranted.

The Congress has always regarded the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems, and their administration, as of particular and primary concern to the employees and employers in the railroad industry and has always attached great weight to any recommendation upon which representatives of the employers and employees have been in agreement.

I ask for unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks a joint letter signed by Earl Leighty, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association and Gregory S. Prince, executive vice president and general counsel of the Association of American Railroads addressed to the Honorable Tom Murray, chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, describing the work of both the Railroad Retirement Board and the National Mediation Board and urging that these agencies be maintained at their present levels of parity with the National Labor Relations Board in the Federal pay system.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 18, 1964.

HON. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the Association of American Railroads and the Railway Labor Executives' Association, are vitally interested in the administration of all statutes affecting our operations including our labor relations handled by the National Mediation Board and the railroad retirement system and the railroad unemployment insurance system handled by the Railroad Retirement Board. These latter two systems are financed by payroll taxes on the railroad industry and the costs of administration including salaries, are also paid from these payroll taxes. Both of these latter systems are administered by the Railroad Retirement Board, a tripartite agency, one member of which is selected upon the recommendation of the railroads, one upon the recommendation of labor organizations representing railroad employees and the chairman without recommendation by either group. The National Mediation Board, by statute, is a bipartisan board, not more than two of the three members shall be of the same political party.

We are concerned about the salary levels provided for the three members of the Railroad Retirement Board and the three members of the National Mediation Board, in H.R. 10444 and related bills which were filed on March 16, 1964. Section 302 of title III of these bills establishes a "Federal executive salary schedule" to be divided into six salary levels. Level III of this schedule, which is contained in section 303(c), includes the chairmen of a number of Federal agencies to which the Railroad Retirement Board and the National Mediation Board compare very favorably, either in importance, size, or responsibility, but the Chairmen of the Railroad Retirement Board and the National Mediation Board are not included. Further, while the language with respect to positions in level IV "such other offices and positions the duties and responsibilities of which [the President] deems appropriate for this level" would warrant placing the members of the Railroad Retirement Board and the National Mediation Board in this level, there is similar language with respect to positions in levels V and VI. In view of this we respectfully recommend amendments to these bills which would specifically include the Chairmen of the Railroad Retirement Board and the National Mediation Board in level III and the other members of the Board in level IV.

The railroad retirement system which the Board administers is the nationwide retirement system for employees in the railroad industry. It provides important protection to railroad employees and their dependents and survivors. Employees receive annuities upon their retirement for age or disability. Annuities are paid to their spouses and other dependents and annuities or lump sums are paid to the survivors of railroad employees. The railroad unemployment insurance system which the Board administers provides nationwide unemployment insurance protection for railroad employees in the form of unemployment, sickness, and maternity benefits.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the Railroad Retirement Board paid more than $1,200 million in benefits to 1,200,000 beneficiaries under the two systems. The total amount paid out by the Board through fiscal 1963 is about $14 billion.

The Board employs about 2,000 employees. Among the Government agencies included in section 303(c) of the bill is one with about the same number of employees and 11 with considerably less than this number. In at least 10 of the agencies included in section 303(c), the present salaries of the chairmen and other members of the agencies are $20-500 and $20,000, respectively, the same as of the chairman and members of the Railroad Retirement Board.

The Railroad Retirement Board has an excellent record of performance in the administration of the two systems, and we feel very strongly that, considering the importance, responsibility, and size of the systems the Board administers, the failure to include specifically the chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board in section 303(c) is unwarranted. The same is true of the failure clearly to include the members of the Railroad Retirement Board in level IV.

The Congress has always regarded the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems, and their administration, as of particular and primary concern to the employers and employees in the railroad industry and has always attached great weight to any recommendation upon which representatives of the employers and employees have been in agreement. We have an especially notable record of having been in agreement virtually at all times for more than 25 years on matters pertaining to the administration of the two systems.

The National Mediation Board has the responsibility for the administration of the Railway Labor Act. This Board, over a period of some almost 30 years, has maintained a unique record for the preservation of the stability of labor management relations in this field. In addition, the National Mediation Board has the responsibility, under the same statute, for labor management relations among carriers by air and their em-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ployees. In this relatively new field of burgeoning employment, now exceeding 500,000 employees, the Board's record over the past 25 years has been equally successful. The maintenance of the flow of commerce along these vital arteries requires the highest degree of responsibility and application by the members of this Board. In addition its agents and employees are in constant touch with the leaders of labor and management in these fields on almost a daily basis to prevent a disruption in the flow of interstate commerce. The National Mediation Board has the additional responsibility of administering the affairs and budget of the National Railroad Adjustment Board in Chicago. This latter agency faces the task of adjusting thousands of minor disputes during the course of each year. In all, the stability of the employment relationship of over a million and a quarter wage earners in the United States are affected by the operations of the National Mediation Board.

As representatives of those who, in effect, pay the salaries of the three members of the Railroad Retirement Board and who are vitally concerned with the ability of the National Mediation Board to effectively administer its program, we respectfully request that section 303 of the bill H.R. 10444 be amended by inserting in subsection (c) after line 13 on page 42 the following:

"(45) Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board.

"(46) Chairman of the National Mediation Board."; and by inserting in subsection (e) in line 2 on page 43 after the word "positions" the following:

"(including, but not limited to, members of the Railroad Retirement Board and members of the National Mediation Board)"

We shall appreciate it if you will see that our proposed amendments and the reasons therefor are made available to and given consideration by the committee.

Sincerely yours,

By GREGORY S. PRINCE,
Executive Vice President and General Counsel, Association of American Railroads.

By G. E. LEIGHTY,
Chairman, Railway Labor Executives' Association.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my amendment would remove this threatened inequality and would restore the Railroad Retirement Board to the high level in Government in which it belongs.

Finally, I must point out that the reported bill discriminates against the members of the National Mediation Board and the Railroad Retirement Board in the same way in which it discriminates against their chairmen. In each case, the members have been downgraded to level 5 of the Federal executive salary schedule whereas the members of the National Labor Relations Board have been placed in level 4. This is precisely the same kind of downgrading which the bill imposes on the chairmen of these agencies and constitutes, in my judgment, rank discrimination against the members of these important agencies. My amendment proposes to repair this injustice.

In closing my remarks, I should like to point out that the House bill, recognizing the realities of the role of these various agencies in the Federal Government, accorded to each of them the same rank and dignity which they have always enjoyed.

There is not a shred of evidence to justify that these agencies are no longer entitled to the class A status which they have so long merited. Each continues to perform in its own way the same significant and effective role in the administration of the national labor policy. The House bill, in recognition of these facts, continue to classify the agencies in the same way.

The chairman of the Senate committee has assured me that this amendment will go to conference and will receive the very careful consideration of the Senate conferees. I understand that the chairman himself is not opposed to it, but I should like to have it go to conference without any binding commitment upon the Senate conferees.

My respect for and confidence in the conferees of the Senate is such that I am perfectly willing to enter into that understanding, if it can be implemented—and I am sure it can be—under the able leadership of the Senator from South Carolina, though I should like to have him make a brief statement of his position.

Mr. JOHNSTON. What the Senator has said is absolutely true. We have discussed this subject, and the amendment will go to conference. These amounts were left to the President, it will be recalled by members of the committee, to put them in whatever class the President desired to put them into. That being si, it will be a matter for the conferees.

Mr. MORSE. With that understanding, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon is withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, we have before us a vitally important bill, H.R. 11049, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964. It is important that those who work for the Federal Government receive compensation nearly the approximate equivalent of that received by their counterparts in responsibility in the business world.

Recently, a number of top Government officials regretably, have had to leave their jobs because their salaries were not adequate to meet their personal needs. The loss of outstanding men and women and the inability to attract top-flight talent leave our Government in a serious predicament. The ability to run a government efficiently and well depends in large part on the caliber of those who fill responsible positions. When we fail to retain or to bring such persons into the Federal service, all of us suffer the consequences—and particularly the taxpayers, who have every right to demand that their tax dollars be used in the most effective and efficient manner possible.

Some have criticized Congress for raising the salaries of its Members. This I consider unjustified and unwarranted by the facts. While I personally am fortunate enough not to need this raise, the fact remains that a very large percentage of Senators and Congressmen have as their sole source of income, their salaries. They are faced with high, but inescapable, expenses, of which the public is often unaware—the need to maintain a residence in Washington and in the home State, travel and entertainment expenses, and certain office costs that exceed the allotments granted Members. To demand of Members of Congress—and rightfully so—the very highest standards, but then to deny them an adequate salary, strikes me as somewhat hypocritical.

The arguments I have advanced apply equally across the board, whether in reference to a postal clerk or a judge on the Supreme Court. Good men deserve good treatment, and one of the indicators is an adequate salary.

I am particularly pleased that the Senate committee revised the scale of wages for those in the middle grades of the classified service. This is extremely important, for it is in these grades that we bring in the bright young men and young women who eventually will occupy the top positions in Government. We cannot attract them if we are not willing to pay them adequate salaries.

For instance, in my own State of Rhode Island, nearly 12,500 civilians are working for the Federal Government. They are productive, and do an excellent job. But, like everyone else, they are affected by rises in the cost of living, educational expenses, and the many other responsibilities that confront the average American family.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1093 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 109, beginning with the word "in" in line 4, strike out through line 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "at the rate of 6 per centum of his gross compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law)."

On page 109, beginning with the word "an" in line 20, strike out through line 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "6 per centum."

On page 112, beginning with the word "an" in line 17, strike out through line 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "6 per centum."

On page 113, line 4, strike out "$22,945" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000".

On page 114, line 3, strike out "$26,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,500".

On page 114, line 6, strike out "$24,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,500".

On page 114, line 8, strike out "$22,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,500".

On page 114, line 13, strike out "$27,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,500".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to reduce the amount to be paid to the legislative employees of the Senate as provided in the bill and have it raised to 6 percent. As the Senator from South Carolina stated yesterday, in 1962 we had an across-the-board raise of salaries for legislative employees of 7 percent.

Here we are 2 years later, and under the provisions of this bill, the salaries of

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Senate employees are raised as much as 21½ percent.

What I seek to do is to put a maximum of 6 percent on the salaries which, together with the 7 percent that Congress granted last year, will total a 13-percent increase since 1962. Under the bill that was enacted in 1962, with a base pay of $8,880, an administrative assistant received $18,884. Under this bill, that same base pay would increase to a pay of $22,945, a sum in excess of what Senators are now receiving. And the same rate practically goes on up to a base pay of, say, $6,005, where an increase of 16½ percent, down to the 21½ percent for the highest pay for the administrative officer.

The amendment covers the salaries of the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms, the Architect of the Capitol, and his administrative assistant.

Under the present law, the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate receives $21,500. If this bill were enacted, that same official would receive $27,500—an increase of $500 a month, or a percentage increase of 27.9 percent.

In addition to that, the Sergeant at Arms is furnished an automobile. He is furnished a chauffeur. He will be better off than a Senator, if the Senator receives the increased amount that is now provided for in the bill. If this bill were enacted by the Senate, as presented by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the Sergeant at Arms would receive $27,500—only $2,500 less than a Senator.

On yesterday, my good friend compared the work of the Sergeant at Arms to that of the police chief of the city of New York. Of course, this is not a valid comparison. The Sergeant at Arms is a nice fellow, but this job is more or less political. And to increase his salary overnight by $500 a month cannot be justified by anyone.

The same thing holds true for the Secretary of the Senate, who now receives $21,500. The increase would raise his salary to $27,500, or an increase of 27.9 percent.

We furnish the Secretary of the Senate with an automobile and a chauffeur. I would say that the Secretary of the Senate is getting more money than a Senator would if the bill were passed as presently written.

The Architect of the Capitol now receives $20,700. If this bill were passed, we would grant him an increase to $26,000, or an increase of 26.1 percent.

Mr. President, that is unconscionable. An administrative assistant would be raised from $18,880 to $22,945, or a raise of $4,065, or 21.5 percent of what he is now receiving.

My amendment is very simple. What it would do is give an across-the-board increase, the same as we did in 1962. That year, we gave an across-the-board increase of 7 percent. My amendment would give an additional 6 percent. The Secretary of the Senate is now receiving $21,500. Under this amendment, he would be increased to $22,500, the amount that the Senators now receive.

The Sergeant at Arms would receive the same increase. He now receives $21,500, and he would receive $22,500 under this bill. I think it is ample.

The legislative counsel would receive $22,500, an increase of 6 percent, from $21,500.

The General Counsel of GAO now receives $20,000. My amendment would provide for him $22,500.

Now the administrative assistants of Senators would be increased from the total that they can now receive of $18,880, to $20,000. Mr. President, I think that is ample.

This 6-percent increase, together with the 7-percent increase that we allowed last year, is ample for those workers.

Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD at this point two tables that indicate how much the legislative employees are receiving now, and what they will receive under this bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. Senate—Effective Oct. 15, 1962

Basic per annum	*Gross per annum*
$60	$1,020.72
$120	1,162.11
$180	1,303.50
$240	1,444.89
$300	1,586.28
$360	1,727.67
$420	1,869.06
$480	2,010.44
$540	2,151.84
$600	2,293.23
$660	2,434.61
$720	2,576.01
$780	2,717.39
$840	2,855.64
$900	2,968.75
$960	3,081.86
$1,020	3,194.98
$1,080	3,308.08
$1,140	3,421.20
$1,200	3,534.31
$1,260	3,638.01
$1,320	3,741.69
$1,380	3,845.37
$1,440	3,949.07
$1,500	4,052.75
$1,560	4,167.47
$1,620	4,285.68
$1,680	4,403.88
$1,740	4,525.43
$1,800	4,655.47
$1,860	4,785.46
$1,920	4,915.49
$1,980	5,045.53
$2,040	5,175.54
$2,100	5,305.58
$2,160	5,435.56
$2,220	5,565.59
$2,280	5,695.63
$2,340	5,825.64
$2,400	5,955.67
$2,460	6,085.68
$2,520	6,215.70
$2,580	6,345.74
$2,640	6,475.75
$2,700	6,605.79
$2,760	6,735.82
$2,820	6,865.81
$2,880	6,995.86
$2,940	7,125.87
$3,000	7,255.90
$3,060	7,385.93
$3,120	7,515.94
$3,180	7,645.97
$3,240	7,775.96
$3,300	7,906.00
$3,360	8,036.03
$3,420	8,166.04
$3,480	8,296.07
$3,540	8,426.08
$3,600	8,556.11
$3,660	8,686.14

U.S. Senate—Effective Oct. 15, 1962—Con.

Basic per annum	*Gross per annum*
$3,720	$8,816.15
$3,780	8,946.19
$3,840	9,076.20
$3,900	9,206.22
$3,960	9,336.25
$4,020	9,466.27
$4,080	9,596.30
$4,140	9,726.31
$4,200	9,856.33
$4,260	9,986.36
$4,320	10,116.37
$4,380	10,246.39
$4,440	10,376.42
$4,500	10,506.43
$4,560	10,636.46
$4,620	10,764.52
$4,680	10,888.64
$4,740	11,012.73
$4,800	11,136.85
$4,860	11,260.97
$4,920	11,385.08
$4,980	11,509.18
$5,040	11,633.30
$5,100	11,757.41
$5,160	11,881.53
$5,220	12,002.36
$5,280	12,115.18
$5,340	12,228.01
$5,400	12,340.85
$5,460	12,453.66
$5,520	12,566.49
$5,580	12,679.33
$5,640	12,792.16
$5,700	12,904.99
$5,760	13,017.82
$5,820	13,130.65
$5,880	13,243.46
$5,940	13,356.29
$6,000	13,469.14
$6,060	13,581.97
$6,120	13,694.79
$6,180	13,807.62
$6,240	13,920.44
$6,300	14,033.28
$6,360	14,146.10
$6,420	14,258.93
$6,480	14,371.76
$6,540	14,484.59
$6,600	14,597.42
$6,660	14,710.25
$6,720	14,823.08
$6,780	14,935.89
$6,840	15,048.73
$6,900	15,161.57
$6,960	15,274.41
$7,020	15,387.22
$7,080	15,500.05
$7,140	15,612.88
$7,200	15,725.71
$7,260	15,838.54
$7,320	15,951.37
$7,380	16,064.19
$7,440	16,177.01
$7,500	16,289.86
$7,560	16,402.68
$7,620	16,515.51
$7,680	16,628.34
$7,740	16,741.16
$7,800	16,854.00
$7,860	16,966.84
$7,920	17,079.65
$7,980	17,192.48
$8,000	17,230.10
$8,040	17,305.31
$8,100	17,418.16
$8,160	17,583.97
$8,220	17,643.80
$8,280	17,756.63
$8,340	17,869.44
$8,400	17,982.29
$8,460	18,095.12
$8,520	18,207.94
$8,580	18,320.77
$8,640	18,433.60
$8,700	18,546.43
$8,760	18,659.26
$8,820	18,772.09
$8,880	18,880.00

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

LEGISLATIVE SALARY INCREASES

This is designed to provide percentage salary adjustments for legislative employees comparable to those provided for employees under the Classification Act. The increases are provided in an amount equal to 3½ percent of the employee's gross rate plus 1 percent of his gross rate for each whole multiple, or part of a multiple of $500 basic compensation; or an amount equal to 5 percent of such gross rate, whichever is greater.

Multiple	Base	Present gross	Proposed amendment	
			Percent increase	New gross
0	$5	$891	5.0	$935
0.1	50	1,020	5.0	1,071
	500	2,057	5.0	2,160
1	505	2,069	5.5	2,183
2	1,000	3,157	5.5	3,330
2	1,005	3,168	6.5	3,372
2.4	1,200	3,584	6.5	3,764
3	1,500	4,062	6.5	4,316
3	1,505	4,061	7.5	4,366
3.6	1,800	4,655	7.5	5,004
4	2,000	5,088	7.5	5,470
4	2,005	5,099	8.5	5,533
4.8	2,400	5,965	8.5	6,461
5	2,500	6,172	8.5	6,697
5	2,505	6,183	9.5	6,770
6	3,000	7,255	9.5	7,945
6	3,005	7,266	10.5	8,029
7	3,500	8,339	10.5	9,215
7	3,505	8,350	11.5	9,310
7.2	3,600	8,556	11.5	9,540
8	4,000	9,422	11.5	10,506
8	4,005	9,433	12.5	10,613
9	4,500	10,506	12.5	11,819
9	4,505	10,517	13.5	11,937
9.6	4,800	11,136	13.5	12,640
10	5,000	11,550	13.5	13,109
10	5,005	11,560	14.5	13,237
11	5,500	12,528	14.5	14,345
11	5,505	12,538	15.5	14,481
12	6,000	13,469	15.5	15,556
12	6,005	13,478	16.5	15,702
13	6,500	14,409	16.5	16,786
13	6,505	14,418	17.5	16,942
14	7,000	15,349	17.5	18,035
14	7,005	15,359	18.5	18,200
14.4	7,200	15,725	18.5	18,635
15	7,500	16,289	18.5	19,303
15	7,505	16,299	19.5	19,477
16	8,000	17,230	19.5	20,590
16	8,005	17,239	20.5	20,773
17	8,500	18,170	20.5	21,895
17	8,505	18,179	21.5	22,068
17.7	8,880	18,884	21.5	22,945

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I said, it ranges from 5 percent for the employee getting $891 a year—and we have got very few of those now—to those receiving a 21.5-percent increase.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the present-day maximum pay allowable for administrative assistants?

Mr. ELLENDER. Eighteen thousand eight hundred and eighty dollars.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What would the bill do as it now stands?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill as it now stands would provide $22,945.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And what will the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana provide?

Mr. ELLENDER. $20,000. I say that we should use a little sanity on these wage hikes.

I am very hopeful that the Senate will vote for my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, could I ask the Senator from Louisiana a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. All the employees' salaries were not listed. Were they?

Mr. ELLENDER. In what?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. It covers all of the legislative employees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It covers all of the legislative employees, the Chaplain, and so forth?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, even the little pages here. As I said yesterday, when I came to the Senate, the pages were getting $5 a day. This bill increases it to $5,000 a year. I think this is unconscionable.

We gave a cut this year on income taxes. And with all of that, we are proposing to raise these legislative employees, as I said, from 5 to 21½ percent. That cannot be justified, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the salaries referred to are in keeping with the salaries that have been requested by the administration for executive branch employees and approved by the House.

If this amendment is agreed to, we will find that the House employees and offices will have substantial increases, and our officers and employees will not have any increase but the 6 percent.

It is in the higher brackets that we are having trouble in securing the qualified men, both downtown and here.

I do not think any Senator wishes to pay an executive branch employee more than our own employees in the Senate are paid for a position of equivalent rank and responsibility.

The Senator has spoken of the Sergeant at Arms. At the present time there is only $1,000 difference between the salary of the Sergeant at Arms and the salary of a Senator. When the bill passes, there will be a difference of $2,500. So the proposal is in keeping with what we have done in the past. We have tried to regulate salaries so that inconsistencies will not cause a great deal of trouble. I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have been unable to ascertain whether the Comptroller General's rate would be reduced by the amendment of the distinguished Senator. I know that the Counsel would be reduced.

Mr. ELLENDER. Those included are the Secretary of the Senate, the Sergeant at Arms, the Legislative Counsel, the General Counsel of GAO, the Librarian of Congress, the Public Printer, the Architect of the Capitol, the Deputy Librarian, the Deputy Public Printer, and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. MONRONEY. The head of the GAO would not be included in the proposed reductions?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. MONRONEY. He is on that list of officers generally associated together.

Mr. ELLENDER. What I sought to do was to include employees in the legislative branch of the Government. As the Senator knows, the bill would increase the salaries of all employees who are members of the staffs of the millions of subcommittees and special committees that we have.

Mr. MONRONEY. Not necessarily. The Senator knows that only those employees whose salaries were increased by their employer would receive the increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly, but the Senator knows what would happen.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma has never used anywhere near the maximum amount of salary allowance. I am sure that the Senator from Louisiana has not.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure that the Senator from South Carolina has not. The maximum is an amount which very few employees ever attain. If a Senator chooses to use his pay allowance in order to keep his administrative assistant at $22,945, which is the tiptop of the grade of those fine young people who serve and make a lifetime job of their service, then he has a right to do so. As early as 1946 the top staff men of the Senate committees were so classified that they would be able to attract the same quality of men. We would prevent raids upon our staffs of our good men. Otherwise they would be attracted downtown at higher employment wages.

If we are going to pay more to those in the top level of civil service—those in grade 18 in the executive department downtown, who have less hard work to do than our own staff people—we should at least raise the salaries of our own staff people to $22,945 as well.

The ratio has been well kept. We have tried to maintain the differences. There has been a difference of $1,000 between the salary of a Senator and the salary of the Sergeant at Arms and that of the Secretary of the Senate. Under the bill the difference would be $2,500.

As to the Architect of the Capitol, neither of us might agree that he is an excellent architect, but the job—and that is what we are trying to classify—is a job that certainly demands a person of capability. It demands someone who would have that much earning capacity, in order to be able to supervise the myriad things that have to be done in this gigantic Capitol plant, including all the buildings on Capitol Hill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has tried to compare the salaries of the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms with the salary of a Senator. The Senator knows that in the last few years those two officers have received increases in pay whereas Senators have not. That is why the salaries are so close together.

Mr. MONRONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. We have not increased the salaries of those employees.

Mr. ELLENDER. In 1962 there was a 7-percent across-the-board increase.

Mr. MONRONEY. If my memory serves me correctly, the Sergeant at Arms did not——

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. ELLENDER. All employees received an increase.

Mr. MONRONEY. They did not get the full 7 percent. The limitation cut them off.

Mr. ELLENDER. They did get an increase in 1962.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is more correct than I am, because they did receive an increase. But a differential exists. We would now make the differential $2,500, which I believe is a proper differential between the salaries of those two officers and the salary of a Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean that a differential of $2,500 between the salaries of the Sergeant at Arms and the Secretary of the Senate and a Senator is proper?

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe the Senator will find that that has generally been the range of the difference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that the way the Senator evaluates it?

Mr. MONRONEY. The difference between the salaries of the Sergeant at Arms and a Senator?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. The Secretary of the Senate has an automobile, and a chauffeur, and I believe this would amount to, if he is given the $27,500 which is provided in the bill more than a Senator's salary.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator knows that the $2,500 differential is one that represents the difference between the two jobs. But those are the two principal officers of the Senate. We need efficient men in those offices. They spend a great deal of money running the housekeeping functions on our side of the Capitol.

I believe the scale is proper and ought to be maintained. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. All time having expired, and the yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absence because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 463 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Aiken	Gore	Mundt
Allott	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Burdick	Lausche	Symington
Church	Mansfield	Talmadge
Cooper	McClellan	Thurmond
Curtis	McGovern	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Morton	
Goldwater	Moss	

NAYS—63

Anderson	Hartke	Metcalf
Bartlett	Hayden	Monroney
Beall	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Muskie
Bible	Holland	Nelson
Boggs	Humphrey	Neuberger
Brewster	Inouye	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Pearson
Cannon	Javits	Pell
Carlson	Johnston	Prouty
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Clark	Keating	Randolph
Dirksen	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Russell
Douglas	Long, La.	Scott
Eastland	Magnuson	Smith
Edmondson	McCarthy	Sparkman
Ervin	McGee	Stennis
Fulbright	McIntyre	Tower
Gruening	McNamara	Walters
Hart	Mechem	Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—12

Bayh	Fong	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Smathers
Cotton	Kennedy	Yarborough
Engle	Robertson	Young, Ohio

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendments (No. 1093) were rejected.

GOOD GOVERNMENT NEEDS GOOD MEN: GOOD MEN MUST BE PAID

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has passed, and the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has favorably reported, with amendments, the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964, H.R. 11049. I now urge Senate passage.

Enactment of this bill would be a significant step toward updating and making equitable the Federal pay scale. Present levels of payment represent poor economy in several respects. They do not give Government workers fair and reasonable pay. They make it increasingly difficult to recruit and retain top-flight men and women for Government service. They undercut Congress' declared principle that Government workers shall be paid wages comparable to those paid in analogous private positions. Their failure to provide adequate incentives or to attract a sufficient number of capable workers undermines our efforts to achieve efficiency and economy in Government.

The pay adjustment bill would provide salary increases for some 1,700,000 Government employees, including over 7,500 Federal workers located in Alaska.

Over 1 million civil servants, including 6,822 in Alaska, are presently covered by the Classification Act of 1949. The Alaska figure includes 1,323 Army employees, 1,158 with the Air Force, 1,105 with the Department of the Interior, and 1,434 with the FAA. The Classification Act also covers 692 Alaskans working with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 334 with the Department of Agriculture, 268 with the Department of Commerce, 166 with the Navy, and 145 with the Department of the Treasury.

Salary increases granted by the proposed bill to Classification Act employees would be effective at all GS levels. They would average 4.2 percent. Workers at the GS–4 to GS–5 levels would receive boosts of over 6 percent; GS–3 and GS–6 employees would be raised by more than 5 percent. GS–7 to GS–8 increases would average around 4 percent, while those in grades 9 through 12 would run approximately 3 percent.

Another 600,000 of the Federal employees covered by the present bill are now classified under the postal field service, rural carrier, and fourth-class office schedules. This involves 669 Alaskans, including 144 postmasters of fourth-class post offices. Employees covered by the postal field service schedule would receive an average salary increase of 5.6 percent. The boost would be over 6 percent for employees at PFS levels 1 through 4, 5.2 percent at PFS–5, 4 percent at PFS–6, and approximately 3 percent at PFS levels 7 through 11.

A new basis of computation would be used in determining the salaries of postmasters of fourth-class post offices.

The formula for "revenue units," upon which salaries would be based, would consider the amount of mail handled and the service transactions carried out, as well as the gross receipts. This promises to establish a more realistic wage scale for those postmasters, long underpaid, in our small or seasonal offices.

Other sections of the pay adjustment bill increase salaries in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, in the Foreign Service, and in county ASC offices. Increases are also provided for legislative employees and officers, Members of Congress, Federal executives, District of Columbia executives and officers, judicial employees, and Federal judges.

The bill is thus a comprehensive one, attempting to remedy inequities at various wage levels. It acknowledges that top Federal officials cannot expect salaries absolutely commensurate with lucrative private positions; but it still recognizes the need for appreciable increases, in light of the many responsibilities these officials must fulfill and the hardships to which present salary scales subject them.

At the same time, the bill attempts to establish equitable rates down the line, and to set up meaningful ratios between the various grade levels. Thus, we are attempting not only to provide for much-needed increases, but also to establish wage levels that will encourage maximum effort and will provide incentives for continuance and advancement in the Federal service.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

It is all too easy, Mr. President, to underestimate the services rendered by Federal employees working throughout the country—from the highest official levels to the smallest post offices in our Alaska villages. We also tend to underestimate the salaries which these public servants deserve and need. These are the people who must administer the many Federal programs and services; they are the people on whom, in large measure, our domestic welfare and our security and leadership in the world arena are dependent. It is simply not fair for these employees to be underpaid, nor can the country afford it. It is false economy to pay inadequate wages to those upon whom Government efficiency depends. We must attract and hold our most capable citizens to public service. If we are to do so, we must give them adequate compensation and incentive.

Mr. President, I urge the passage of H.R. 11049 as reported by the Senate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

At the end of line 2, page 167, add the following:

"TITLE VI

"Any compensation, honorarium, or other payment received by any Member of Congress for any lecture, appearance, speech, or article written over and above the actual expenses involved shall be turned over to the Treasury of the United States."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

CIVIL RIGHTS—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me for one moment?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have just heard the historic announcement to the Senate that the House has passed finally the civil rights bill, the most momentous piece of legislation, in my judgment, which has come out of the Senate since the declaration of war in World War II.

I thank the Senator for the opportunity at least to call it markedly to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish the RECORD today to note that the act which has just been passed by the House, to which the Speaker has affixed his signature, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, is not only one of the most important pieces of legislation of our time, but it has had amazing bipartisan support. The vote in the House was 289 to 126.

I salute the Members of the House and commend Members of the Senate. I believe we have performed a noble public service.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Kentucky if his amendment would apply to Members of the Senate while Congress was in recess.

Mr. MORTON. Yes; it would apply.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would apply the year round?

Mr. MORTON. It would apply the year round. We are on the payroll the year round.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, we should devote all our time to the business here, and we could not devote any of our time to making public speeches. Is that what the Senator means?

Mr. MORTON. I have no objection to making public speeches.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But they should be made free of charge. Is that it?

Mr. MORTON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORTON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator include in his amendment all income from legal fees and fees collected as directors and also income from dividends? Would he provide that all such sums should be turned over to the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. MORTON. If the Senator wishes to offer such an amendment in his own right, it might be considered. I do not see why a person must be destitute of all property to be able to serve in this body.

My point is this. I made speeches in the 1930's, long before I became a Member of Congress. I was never paid for those speeches. Now, merely because I happen to be a Member of the Senate, people offer me x dollars to come and make a speech. This is only because I happen to be a U.S. Senator, on the public payroll. When I did it in the 1930's, I was not on the public payroll. I therefore think that anything that is offered to me in this connection because I happen to be a U.S. Senator, while being paid by the taxpayers of the United States, should be turned into the Treasury of the United States. I feel that I am an employee of the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator include legal fees? Does he believe they should be turned over to the Treasury? I know of various lawyers whose incomes increased after they had become U.S. Senators.

Mr. MORTON. I am not a lawyer, and I am therefore not qualified to respond to the Senator's question. When I was an officer of the U.S. Government, in the State Department, I was not permitted to accept any sort of honorarium. I was not even permitted to allow the associations that asked me to speak before them to pay my expenses. Either I paid the expenses myself, or the Government paid for them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator amend his amendment so that all legal fees should go to the Treasury?

Mr. MORTON. I should like to have the Senator offer his own amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator wants to be fair. I am sure and make his amendment apply equally.

Mr. MORTON. Yes. What is it that the Senator wants me to do?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To include also legal and directors' fees in his amendment.

Mr. MORTON. In other words, the Senator wants to "louse up" my amendment so that it cannot be adopted. Is that it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I am asking him whether he would be willing to include directors' fees and legal fees, and any amount received from private business, and also I think dividends from whisky stocks.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And cigarettes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And from cigarette stocks, too.

Mr. PASTORE. And from writing books.

Mr. MORTON. I understand that the Senator wants to say that anything that any Member receives, aside from his salary as a Member of Congress, should be reported and turned in to the Treasury. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we follow the precedent of the Senator's amendment, that is what we should do.

Mr. MORTON. In other words, he would have us turn over our dividends from whatever source they were received?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Also especially from whisky and cigarette stocks, because those items, according to the doctors, are very injurious to the human race.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. MORTON. Cigarette stocks have been rather sick lately, I can tell the Senator. I cannot accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. I suggest that he offer it in his own time as a separate amendment.

I yield to the Senator from New Jersey such time as he may desire to take.

Mr. CASE. I believe there is a germ of rightness in this amendment. However, logically the amendment should include not only income from speeches and writings, but also earnings from any source. If a person is a director of a bank, undoubtedly it is because he is a Member of the Senate. I see no reason why a bank director's fees should not be turned over to the Treasury. I would not have the amendment apply to earnings from securities or property owned by the person. However, I believe any other kind of earnings ought to be included. I ask the Senator if he would accept this serious suggestion to amend his amendment accordingly.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator means fees collected as a director of a bank.

Mr. CASE. I mean any earned income as opposed to income from securities, for example. Any fees a lawyer may earn due to his being a Member of the Senate should be included. I do not believe that only one kind of earning should be included.

Mr. MORTON. I cannot agree with the Senator. Suppose I decide to do some moonlighting by babysitting or raking leaves. Should those earnings be included?

Mr. CASE. I cannot imagine anyone trusting the Senator from Kentucky with a daughter of impressionable age.

Mr. MORTON. At 57 years of age, I can.

Mr. CASE. Any earned income might well be due to the fact that one holds the position of Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I respectfully suggest that the amendment be withdrawn?

Mr. MORTON. In an effort to be helpful to my colleagues, and to get this measure on the road, I will accede to the suggestion of my distinguished leader. But before I withdraw the amendment I should like to respond briefly to the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I withdraw my remarks.

Mr. MORTON. I am a director of a bank. When I go to a directors' meeting I am paid $35. I do not get to more than two such directors' meetings a year, because of the long sessions the majority party has been holding in the Senate. I happen to be a director because my grandfather started a little bank, and this ultimately developed into the bank of which I am presently a director.

When I attend a meeting as a director I am paid $35. I get to about two meetings a year. I think my responsibility is far greater than my compensation. If something happens to the bank because I am not there, I can be sued for I do not know how much.

Mr. PASTORE. It might be the very best excuse the Senator could have if he wished to resign from the directorship. The amendment would give him that excuse.

Mr. MORTON. I have tried to resign. Every time I try the president comes to me and say, "Please don't resign." So I stay as a director.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator should accept the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, because that would be the best reason he could have for resigning.

Mr. MORTON. Very well, I will resign from the bank, and I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1079, and ask the clerk to report it as it has been modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read the modified amendment, as follows:

At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. . (a) Section 2(a) of the Act entitled 'An Act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes,' approved September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2283(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) There shall not be paid to any person who, on, or after September 26, 1961, has refused or refuses, or knowingly and willfully has failed or fails, to appear, testify, or produce any book, paper, record, or other document, relating to his service as an officer or employee of the Government or Members of Congress in any proceeding before a congressional committee, for any period subsequent to September 26, 1961, or subsequent to the date of such failure or refusal of such person, whichever date is later, any annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of such person (subject to the exceptions contained in sections 10 (2) and (3) of this Act) which is creditable toward such annuity or retired pay.'

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of such section 2 (a), as amended no person shall be required, by reason of the amendment made by this section, to refund any annuity or retired pay paid to such person prior to the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the amendment as it has been modified merely provides that any public official or former public official who since September 1961 has been requested to appear before a congressional committee to answer questions in line with his official conduct, elected to take the fifth amendment rather than answer the questions would be allowed to receive a refund of all of his contributions to the retirement fund, plus interest, but he would not be eligible for retirement benefits. In 1954 Congress enacted a similar law. On September 26, 1961, the law was repealed, over my objection.

Recently there was an instance in which a former public official took the fifth amendment rather than answer questions that were directed to him about his conduct as a public official.

The amendment does not deal with the right of an individual to take the fifth amendment, but if one who is or has been a public official took the fifth amendment, rather than answer questions which were properly asked concerning his official duties, he would forfeit his right to any further contributions so far as the taxpayers were concerned.

He would have the right to withdraw all of his own contributions, plus interest. There is no question about that. He would be entitled to them. But I do not believe that the portion of his retirement fund which would normally be paid by the Federal Government—by the taxpayers—should be allowed him. That should be forfeited. That is all that my amendment provides.

Congress enacted such a law in 1954, and it was in effect for 7 years. It was repealed in 1961. This amendment would reinstate the act as of the date of repeal.

The amendment as originally printed referred, as did the act of 1954, to taking the fifth amendment before courts. I have stricken that provision upon the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois. The amendment now deals only with employees or former employees of the Federal Government who take the fifth amendment, rather than testify before a congressional committee.

I hope that the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment. If he will not I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Delaware a question. How broad is the amendment? Whom would it cover? What kind of cases?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would cover any employee or former employee of the Federal Government who was called before a congressional committee to answer questions concerning his official activities as a public servant if he took the fifth amendment or had taken it since the repeal of the act in 1961.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The fifth amendment, which many persons have invoked, is a part of the Constitution. Would the Senator's amendment be in violation of a person's right under that amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If an employee appeared before a committee and refused to answer some question because to do so might incriminate him—which he would have the right to do under the fifth amendment—would his annuity be taken away from him?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the question were directed to the person's conduct as a public official, yes. Why should it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator's amendment would penalize him and might possibly cause him to disclose some knowledge concerning national security. He might be asked to disclose information of that nature, and be penalized unjustly for not doing so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. The amendment merely provides that if an employee of the U.S. Government wished to invoke the fifth amendment rather than answer proper questions asked him by a congressional committee concern-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ing his conduct as a public official, he would merely forfeit any further right to the contributions so far as the taxpayers' part is concerned. Why should he not forfeit it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would we not be taking away from him the annuity on which he had paid, and as to which the Government had entered into a contract with him, because he refused to answer a question and invoked the fifth amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is done in the armed services now. The Senator voted for that. Every Member of the Senate approved it.

Under existing law if one has served in the armed services for 20 years and has established his full eligibility for a pension, and then reenlists, and in the course of his reenlistment is dishonorably discharged, an additional penalty is imposed on him. He loses all the retirement benefits for which he would have been eligible had he not reenlisted. That is the law.

What is wrong with providing the same requirement with respect to civil employees of the Government? Anyone who is affected by the amendment can return the next day and say, "I am willing to talk and answer the questions," and can reinstate himself. He would have complete control with respect to answering the questions.

I am not suggesting that the amendment applies to questions about his outside activities; but certainly an official of the U.S. Government should be required to answer before a congressional committee questions that are asked of him in connection with his official activities. That is all I am proposing. If a penalty is to be suffered he will impose it on himself. If he wishes to remove it he can advise the committee the very next day that he is willing to answer.

Mr. JOHNSTON. But a question of internal security might be involved in his refusal to answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It could be a question of personal security as for as the law is concerned. So far as the armed services are concerned if a man goes off and gets drunk or creates an incident on the outside, completely nonrelated to the armed services, he may receive a dishonorable discharge and thus will forfeit his pension rights.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the amendment apply to Members of Congress?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would apply to Members of the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; to any public official who refused to testify before a committee and took the fifth amendment on the ground that to respond to questions of the committee would incriminate him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely thought that if such a provision were to be included in the bill, it should apply to Members of Congress, as well as to members of the staff and other employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes. It would apply to any officer or employee of the Government. This question was raised once before.

Mr. President, to avoid any misunderstanding I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment on page 2, after the word "Government" in line 1, to include "or Members of Congress." Then there will be no misunderstanding. I am sure they are already covered, but I ask unanimous consent that the words "Members of Congress" be inserted at that point because we want to be certain they are covered. I thought they were covered, but I want to be certain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The amendment is clearly unconstitutional under the decision of the Supreme Court in the Slochower case. In that case, a professor of the College of the City of New York was called before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and interrogated concerning his official conduct as a teacher. He took the fifth amendment. An ordinance of the city of New York provided that whenever an employee of the city of New York took the fifth amendment when he was being interrogated about his official conduct, he was automatically discharged.

When that case was brought before the Supreme Court of the United States, the Court ruled that it was unconstitutional to penalize a man for exercising his constitutional right or constitutional privilege not to incriminate himself. That is exactly what the amendment offered by the able and distinguished Senator from Delaware would do. The amendment is a flagrant, brazen violation of the Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

Mr. MUNDT. I invite the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that he is talking about a case involving a teacher in a college in New York appearing before a Government committee. That is not a relevant case to the argument, because we are talking about the right of the Government to deal with its employees and to establish criteria and rules and regulations concerning employee benefits while working for Uncle Sam.

It is about time that Congress did take some action to be sure that those who have important information that the country needs will get it, because our employees of the Government are not permitted to lurk behind the fifth amendment and continue to enjoy all of the benefits that they would have if they were responsive to the needs of the country and gave Congress the information it requires.

We enacted the legislation one time before. It was never ruled unconstitutional by any court. Congress, in a moment of exuberance, or carelessness, or something, repealed it without adequate debate.

I am glad that we have this issue before us again and that we have a rollcall vote ordered on it. I believe that it is time Congress asserted itself, as to whether it has the right to establish criteria governing employment of those working for it, and if Congress has that right, it has every right in the world to establish whether they will get employment benefits or retirement benefits.

I support the amendment and I hope it will pass overwhelmingly on the rollcall vote.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from North Carolina for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. ERVIN. I would say to my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota that I have been talking about a case on all fours with the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I was talking about a case in which the Supreme Court held that whenever the Government undertakes to penalize a man for exercising rights conferred upon him by the Constitution, the action of the Government is unconstitutional.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I concur in what the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, that there is no comparison between these two cases. The case mentioned involves an employee of the State of New York who was directed to come before a committee of Congress.

In this instance, these are employees of the U.S. Government, asked to come before a committee of the Congress. We are dealing here solely with Federal Government operations and nothing else. As I stated before, we passed this legislation in 1954. It stayed on the statute books until 1961. It was not declared unconstitutional—it was repealed by Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that under the Senator's amendment, if such a person does take the fifth amendment, he can and does get back the amounts which he has paid in to date with whatever interest is allowed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Government pays a refund, yes.

Mr. KEATING. That is the important distinction between this and the case referred to by the Senator from North Carolina. In that case the man was fired without a refund; in other words, he was penalized. In this case, he is not penalized. He gets back what he has paid in, with interest.

He simply does not thereafter reap further benefits from the taxpayers of the country.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. He can reinstate this on 24 hours' notice by offering to appear before the committee. We have been doing this for years with the armed services. It is the law today. Each member of the armed services has accumulated retirement benefits eligible after 20 years. If he then elects to reenlist for 1 year or 5 years and during the course of that reenlistment he is dishonorably discharged or receives a discharge other than honorable he forfeits all of his privileges and retirement benefits. This is true even though he could have retired prior to a second enlistment and received such benefits. That is the law. There is nothing unusual in this procedure. It has never been declared unconstitutional. It was on the statute books for 7 years. Let us face it—this could be called the Bobby Baker amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me another 30 seconds?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am glad to yield 30 seconds to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. ERVIN. This amendment is not only unconstitutional on the grounds I have mentioned, in that it constitutes an attempt to penalize a man for the exercise of his rights under the Constitution but it is also unconstitutional on another ground. The amendment is retroactive to September 1961 and penalizes a man for an act already committed and therefore is in violation of the provisions of the Constitution which prohibits passage of ex post facto laws.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield briefly to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. This amendment simply provides that any Government employee who claims the privilege against self-incrimination pursuant to the fifth amendment to the Constitution would thereafter be deprived of any retirement benefits due to him from a Government retirement plan. The amendment in no way prohibits a person from invoking the provisions of the fifth amendment.

The provisions of the pending amendment differ from the situation which existed and led to the Supreme Court decision of Slochower against the Board of Higher Education of New York City, which was handed down in 1955. In that case, the individual who claimed the fifth amendment before a Senate committee was automatically discharged from his job as professor at Brooklyn College, in New York. A contractual employment relationship existed between the city of New York and the appellant Slochower, in that case. However, Mr. President, there is no contractual obligation on the part of Congress to provide retirement benefits. Such benefits are modified from time to time and may be withdrawn by Congress at will. Under these circumstances, it is clear that Congress may provide for denial of retirement benefits in individual cases upon such grounds as it may determine valid. Under the provisions of the pending amendment, if an individual took refuge in the fifth amendment, he could still retain his position, but he would forfeit his retirement pay; and the amount he had already put in would be returned to him.

It is argued that the retroactive feature of this amendment makes this proposal an ex post facto law. In the 1798 case of Calder against Bull, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the prohibition against ex post facto laws contained in the Constitution applied only to penal and criminal statutes. This amendment does not make it a crime to invoke the fifth amendment, and, therefore, does not violate the prohibition against ex post facto laws as contained in the Constitution. It is essential to the proper functioning of the Government that it be able to secure from its employees information concerning the performance of their official duties. Refusal by Government employees to disclose pertinent facts and records concerning their official duties constitutes a serious disservice to the Government and the Nation. Employees who do refuse to make such disclosures should by no means be beneficiaries of rewards, over and above their salaries. They should be denied retirement benefits. I strongly support adoption of the Williams amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Delaware that this amendment is prospective, or would it be retroactive and apply to a pension which has already been earned?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment is both. There is not a single Senator who does not know what the purpose of this amendment is. Let us vote on it accordingly.

Mr. METCALF. Would it not be open to the legal objection that if it were retroactive and applied to pensions already earned, would it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment provides in this last paragraph that it would not require a refund of any annuities which have been collected prior to the enactment.

It does stops the benefits prospectively, but it does not require retroactive payment back into the Government if a man has retired prior thereto and has drawn in excess of the amount to which he would be entitled. Thus there is no retroactive payment.

It does say that if he takes the fifth amendment that from that time on, from that day forward, he would not be eligible to any further benefits of the taxpayers' money. Congress passed such a bill once; it repealed it in 1961. This would reinstate it, and we all know what the purpose of it is. Let us vote on it.

Mr. METCALF. This would only apply to pensions previously earned after the amendment is adopted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would apply to all pension privileges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania 3 minutes. It happens that he held hearings on this particular matter in 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope very strongly that this amendment will be soundly defeated. It is an old chestnut and goes back to the hysteria surrounding the attack on Government employees during the height of the McCarthy scare some 10 years ago when Federal employees were quite literally in fear of their lives or of their jobs or of their pay. It was a time when the name Alger Hiss was bruited about this Chamber and everyone quivered with fear when that name was mentioned, because of the idea that if they did anything that might conceivably support Alger Hiss—who was, it is true, a traitor to his country—they would be damned by guilt by association with the same unfortunate public reputation.

On September 1, 1961, as chairman of the Retirement Subcommittee, it was my good fortune to report a bill dealing with H.R. 6141, proposing to forfeit civilian annuities and military retirement pay.

We made a most comprehensive study of that particular bill and we concluded that it was not in the national interest, that it was probably unconstitutional, that it violated the civil liberties of employees of the United States and in the end, I am happy to say, the report of that committee was upheld by the Senate and the so-called Hiss bill was not passed.

We are now dealing with the spiritual successor of that particular piece of legislation.

The fifth amendment is enshrined as a part of that Constitution. It is not a particularly popular amendment but it is an essential part of the civil liberties of American citizens, determined by our forefathers when they framed the Constitution to be essential to that freedom for which they had fought the war of the Revolution.

This is an effort to whittle away at the sacred right given to all Americans to take their liberties, to speak their piece, and to assert the right against discrimination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. If they so felt, the question as to whether they should forfeit their annuities or not would not be decided in advance of the fact. This is a matter that we should leave on an ad hoc basis as to the situation if it should arise at some time. I think this is fundamentally an un-American amendment. I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield the Senator from New Jersey 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE. I think there is some question as to whether this may or may not be within the constitutional power so far as it relates to service heretofore rendered and rights already accrued. I do not really have any doubt but that this would not be separable, or that service hereafter rendered and rights for services hereafter rendered would be constitutional.

The Senator from Pennsylvania said that it goes back to Alger Hiss. I suggest that it goes back to at least a generation before that. I remember as a young man in New York when Governor Roosevelt required that public employees who failed to waive immunity before grand juries in regard to their official acts would have to leave the public service. And Jimmy Walker was one of those. And this is how it happened. It is a direct precedent, I think, for the action which we seek to take here.

I do not think it really has anything to do with punishing a person. I think this has to do with the Senate's proper efforts to police itself and its employees. I wish that the Committee on Rules and Administration had exhibited the kind of energy and diligence in the matter still before it—although it claims now to have finished—that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] exhibited in regard to giving us the tools with which to do the job.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes on the bill?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, we have been looking backward. There is clear evidence of an effort to confuse the nature of the amendment by talking about Alger Hiss and times long past.

I do not regard this amendment as particularly concerning Alger Hiss, or concerning this body. This is not what this amendment is directed at. Let us bring it out in the open.

This amendment is not directed against those from whom we might seek to recover retroactively nearly as much as it is designed to cover a situation which will no doubt happen in the future—perhaps in the near future.

This amendment, if adopted, would return to Bobby Baker whatever investment he has paid in, with the interest allowed by the Government on the refund. It would make it impossible for Bobby Baker to draw a pension in reward for the disservice which he has rendered to the Senate and to the people of the United States.

If we want to go on record as saying that Bobby Baker is to be rewarded, that Bobby Baker is to be treated as if he had not defied the Senate, and a Senate committee—one of their most trusted employees—if we want to say, "Let us shovel out the Government money to Bobby Baker," we should join the friends of Bobby Baker. But I will not do it. I will support the Williams amendment for the reasons that I stated.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 321. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, July 2, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964;

H. Con. Res. 322. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions until July 20, 1964; and

H. Con. Res. 323. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to return the enrolled bill (H.R. 10053) to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

HOUSE ADJOURNMENT FROM JULY 2 TO JULY 20, 1964—SENATE ADJOURNMENT FROM JULY 10 to JULY 20, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily, for not to exceed 2 minutes, probably less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection. It is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. House Concurrent Resolution 321:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, July 2, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the resolution, it is proposed to add the following resolving clause:

Resolved further, That when the Senate adjourns on Friday, July 10, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridan, July 20, 1964.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, is the resolution subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is subject to amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not want to prolong a controversy. But I have an amendment to suggest if the majority leader would be willing to accept it and make it a part of the resolution. I suggest adding the words, "also the U.S. Senate."

Mr. MANSFIELD. We are included, beginning on the 10th.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senate is covered?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. That is what I wanted to be sure of.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 321), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk another resolution, to make sure that we are not caught shorthanded this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. House Concurrent Resolution 322:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding any adjournment of the two Houses until July 20, 1964, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 322) is agreed to.

REQUEST TO PRESIDENT FOR RETURN OF ENROLLED BILL (H.R. 10053) TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the next concurrent resolution coming over from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. House Concurrent Resolution 323:

The President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing the bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following correction:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the proviso in the second sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1152 (b)), is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1964,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1965,'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. I object. It is important and excellent legislation. There may be amendments. We do not have anything in the RECORD on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I withdraw the resolution. We can go back on limited time and attend to that later.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my judgment is that Congress can place a condition upon employees. I believe if some people believe that this will not affect anyone retroactively, they will be disappointed.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield 3 minutes to the Sentor from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, Congress has already retroactively taken away the retirement benefits of Alger Hiss. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania did not include a repeal of that proposal in his bill. He exempted it from repeal in the bill in 1961. The provision of the 1954 act had taken away the retirement benefits of Alger Hiss retroactively. No man or court has ruled against it. We have done it once. We can do it again.

The only reason that the law was repealed in 1961 was in my opinion for the sole purpose of making eligible for retirement benefits every crook and scoundrel who has been convicted in court for acceptance of bribes or embezzlement of Government funds under the exposures of the Internal Revenue scandals.

That was the 1954 act, of which I was a cosponsor. It was designed to deny retirement benefits to all crooks and scoundrels who had been found to have accepted bribes in connection with their official activities or who were convicted of the embezzlement of Government funds. Those people were reinstated on Government retirement rolls by the 1961 legislation sponsored by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

My amendment here today would reinstate the provision of the 1954 act relating to the fifth amendment. Senators know why it is being done; it is to prevent Bobby Baker from collecting a Government retirement pension of nearly $10,000 per year while taking the fifth amendment before a congressional committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma for 2 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the purpose for repealing the act in 1961 was because the act covered every phase of Government. Dozens of cases of letter carriers that were caught in the arms of the law without having been guilty of any crime remotely connected with the faithful performance of their duties as Government employees came to the attention of the committee.

The bill would not affect one man, as the Senator would have us do. It would provide for retroactive punishment. We would not only enact a law covering a case which had already occurred, but also we would bring into a state of fear, I believe, every one of our nearly 2 million Government employees. They would not be subject to normal prosecution or penalties. They would be subject to a penalty assessed against them for failure to divulge everything they knew in response to a question asked by a congressional committee. The amendment does not even provide that the committee must be a regular committee. It could be an ad hoc committee. It could be a subcommittee. There are many such committees. But every Government employee would be subject to the punishment of discharge from his position.

If it were the decision of the Senate to pass a bill which would effect the cessation of employment of such an employee, I would be wholly in favor of imposing such a penalty of the loss of one's job. I should be perfectly willing to see any law that applies to any one of the 190 million people in this Nation applied to Government employees. But I hardly think that taking away a retirement fund that a letter carrier or someone working in a Government department has acquired through faithful performance is proper legislation. Such an employee has put his money up. He was not putting it in a savings bank; he was buying an insurance policy for his retirement, and that policy was signed by the Government of the United States at the time he bought it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield the Senator from Oklahoma 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is now proposed to attach to a pay bill that involves a thousand different items, without 1 minute's hearings before any committee, an amendment of the nature of the one proposed.

I do not believe our committee would be the proper committee to hear the testimony, but the Senator did not even appear before our committee to present his amendment. In less than 30 minutes we are asked to pass on a question that does not involve a job status that an employee would have to forfeit. The amendment would compel him to sacrifice the contract that he had and on which he had been paying. Of course, he would receive back his money with interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. Whom would we punish? The full range of Federal law to put him in jail is available if the employee could be convicted before a jury of his peers. Full action can be taken on that question. But whom would we damage by the amendment? We would damage the wife or the children who would be the beneficiaries of the insurance policy that the employees had bought in good faith.

I am not ready to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware because I do not believe it is in the American tradition.

I respect the statement of my friend the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], who is a great lawyer, that the amendment would be unconstitutional.

I believe the thing to do is to pass the bill, and permit the proper legislative committee to conduct hearings on the proposal. It should not be added, at this late hour, as a rider to the bill, for it would jeopardize the pension and retirement funds that have been created over the years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] on the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there is not a rural mail carrier who could be brought under the bill unless that rural mail carrier were called before a congressional committee and refused to disclose before that committee some important information he had vital to the hearing, in which case he should not be entitled to the benefits of the pension program.

By the adoption of the Williams amendment, we can at least keep the bill from being labeled as a bill for the relief of Bobby Baker. That is what it adds up to. That is the instant case. We have taken care of his case. The question is, should we perpetuate the benefits of Government service for a man who has refused to come before a congressional committee or should we not? I believe we should not. At the same time, I think we should make clear to other faithless employees of the Federal Government that they will be expected to testify when they are called upon.

I recommend adoption of the Williams amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. On this question all time has expired, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 464 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Aiken	Douglas	Mundt
Allott	Eastland	Pastore
Beall	Goldwater	Pearson
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Boggs	Javits	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Carlson	Keating	Smith
Case	Kuchel	Thurmond
Church	Lausche	Tower
Cooper	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Curtis	Mechem	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Morton	

NAYS—52

Anderson	Hill	Morse
Bartlett	Holland	Moss
Bible	Humphrey	Muskie
Brewster	Inouye	Nelson
Burdick	Jackson	Neuberger
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Pell
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Clark	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Dodd	Long, La.	Ribicoff
Edmondson	Magnuson	Robertson
Ellender	Mansfield	Russell
Ervin	McCarthy	Sparkman
Fulbright	McGee	Stennis
Gore	McGovern	Symington
Gruening	McIntyre	Walters
Hart	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Metcalf	
Hayden	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—10

Bayh	Hruska	Talmadge
Cotton	Kennedy	Yarborough
Engle	Saltonstall	
Fong	Smathers	

So Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while the majority leader is in the Chamber, I should like to ask him if he can clarify for the Members of the Senate what the schedule is likely to be starting with Monday, and whether there will be any yea and nay votes, or whether any major items will come up for consideration before the recess on Friday, July 10.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader and I have discussed this matter, and we expect appropriation and other bills of worthwhile significance to come up next week. The Senate is not remaining in session until the 10th of July for the fun of it. We intend to conduct business of the Senate. We are very hopeful that there will be legislation available Monday which will be taken up, and very likely there will be some legislation which may cause a little controversy, and therefore raise the possibility of quorum calls and votes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator from Montana include in that statement the possibility of votes on Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1091.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment (No. 1091), as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. 502. Section 1(e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251 (e)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) The term "average salary" shall mean the annual rate resulting from averaging over all periods of civilian service used in the computation of an annuity under this Act a Member's or an employee's rates of basic salary in effect during such periods, with each rate weighted by the time it was in effect'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats or retire to the cloakrooms.

Mr LAUSCHE. Mr. President, during the discussion of the bill mention was made of the adverse impact which the passage of the bill would have on the retirement fund for public employees. It is admitted that the impact would be in the sum of $1,250 million. The figure is completely separate and apart from the $550 million cost of the bill by way of increased salaries.

When the Public Employees Retirement Fund was established, it was predicated upon an actuarial structure which was sound.

The amount of the contributions made, respectively, by the Government and by the employees, was adequate to sustain the fund. However, since the establishment of the fund, it has been increasingly weakened by various things which have been done by Congress. I have before me a report of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Retirement of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate. The hearing was conducted on August 14, 1963, and, I believe, on several days thereafter. At the hearing, Mr. Macy, of the Civil Service Commission, testified. He stated that as of the beginning of the fiscal year 1965—that would be the first of July of this year, yesterday—the obligations of the fund would be $49 billion, the money available would be $14 billion, and the unfounded liability would be $35 billion.

May we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For the benefit of those who are listening, I should like to have order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would the bill increase the contributions to the fund?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would not, but it changes the base upon which the retirement pay is to be calculated.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, it increases the amount to be paid out, but does not do anything to replenish the fund. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. The bill would increase the amount that would be paid out, but it would do nothing to finance the increase in the obligation.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is where the billion and some odd dollars that the Senator has referred to is involved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

The adoption of the increased pay would impose an added obligation on the fund of $1,250 million. No increased contributions are provided with which to finance the increased obligations.

Mr. Macy testified that there are several reasons why the fund has become actuarially unsound. He said:

The second factor has been periodic liberalizations which have been made by Congress without payment to cover past service liability. These liberalizations are of four different types: Annuity increases for those already retired, such as those enacted last year. Pay increases for active employment, such as those enacted last year. These pay increases have a future liability impact upon the annuity rate and the annuity fund.

It is thus clear, Mr. President, that as we increase the annuities, and as we increase the pay, and as we bring other persons within the coverage, we increase the burden of the obligations that are put on the fund.

The consequence of these liberalizations, in part, and the failure of the Government to pay its share on a pay-as-you-go basis, have created this shocking situation: $49 billion of obligations, $14 billion of money available to pay those obligations, and $35 billion of unfunded liabilities.

With the passage of the bill the obligations would be increased by $1,250 million, without any financing of the obligation, as indicated by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Senators might ask me what I propose to do. When the retirement fund was originally established, the actuarial calculation was sound. The formula for establishing the base was that we shall take the average salary of the employee through his whole career. Later that formula was changed, and the formula that was adopted provided that we would take the 5 years of the highest salary in fixing the base. With that formula of 5 highest years, any one of us, at the end of 5 years, would have our lifetime annuity established on the basis of 5 years at $30,000 without any regard of the former years that we served either at $22,500 or at $12,500.

I have made a calculation. Let us assume that I have served 12 years at $22,500 a year. My annuity pay would be $6,750 a year or $562.50 a month. That is on 12 years of service with a salary of $22,500.

If we raise the salaries to $30,000, and I have served 12 years, 7 of which was at

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

$22,500 and 5 at $30,000, my retirement pay would be $9,000 a year, or $733 a month, that being $61 a month more.

Under my formula, we would take the average pay received through the 12 years, 7 years at $22,500, and 5 years at $30,000, added together, and then establishing what the average wage would be over the 12 years.

Under my formula, the pension would be $7,187 a year.

To recapitulate, under the existing formula, with a $22,500 a year salary, the pension is $562.50 a month. Under the bill if it is passed, without my amendment, it would be $733 a month. If my amendment were adopted, it would be $718 a month.

All I ask is that we should not count the 5 highest years, but the average of all the years of employment.

My amendment applies not only to Senators, but also to every employee of the Government. To illustrate further, let us consider the civil service employee who has served 20 years—the first 10 years at $5,000, the next 5 years at $8,000, and the last 5 years at $15,000. His retirement pay under present law is calculated on the $15,000 a year salary, without regard for his service of 5 years at $5,000 and 5 years at $8,000.

In addition, when he began at $5,000, he paid a premium on the basis of $5,000. In the next 5 years, at a salary of $8,000, the premium was based on the $8,000. In the last 5 years, when he was earning $15,000, the premium was on the basis of $15,000. So it can readily be seen that the amount of the contribution made is not adequate to sustain the fund.

I feel very keenly about this. I do so because I think it can be clearly demonstrated that the fund must go into bankruptcy eventually, unless Congress does something to remedy the wrong. I read further from Mr. Macy's statement:

> As I have already indicated, in 1965, the fund would be $14 billion; the unfunded liability, $35 billion. In 7 years the fund would be $17 billion; the unfunded liability, $41 billion. In 1975, the fund would be $16 billion. In other words, it would have fallen off in that period, and the unfunded liability would have grown to $49 billion from the present level of $35 billion.

Mr. Macy goes on to state that by 1990 the fund would be broke. My question is: Can we tolerate that situation? We cannot. We should approach the problem on a realistic, sound economic basis.

It is true that we would expect that the Government eventually would pay the $35 billion due now and probably the $49 billion that would be due at a later date; but if and when it does, those amounts will have to be paid out of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator's amendment would provide that a person who has been with the Government 25 or 30 years, who started at $1,500 a year, and who is now receiving $15,000, would have to go back and include the years during which he was paid $1,500 and reach a general average of all the years. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Under the retirement system, it has always been the practice that when a person was employed he had to sign for retirement benefits. When he did so, he knew how much he would have to pay into the fund, and he also knew how much the Government would pay in to match his contribution. He signed up in the system with the understanding that his retirement would be based on the average of the 5 highest years' salary. That would be the basis of the computation of his retirement annuity. Is not that true?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is true; but the Senator's statement demonstrates the fallacy of the law as it is now written.

The Senator admits that the retirement pay of the person who signed up when he was earning $1,500 a year and subsequently received $15,000 annually for his last 5 years would be predicated on the 5 years at $15,000, completely forgetting that for the previous years he was earning $1,500.

Mr. JOHNSTON. With one proviso: Provided he had been drawing $15,000 annually for 5 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct; but I ask the Senator from South Carolina: What will become of the fund under the formula which he is urging? It is now growing constantly bigger. If the Senator says it is not, then I shall read to him what Mr. Macy said about the subject.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Annually the fund has been growing. It now has approximately $14.5 billion. Last year it was $13 billion. We were told years ago what would happen.

The Civil Service Commission takes into consideration all employees and assumes that they will all remain with the Government for the full term. But all employees do not do that. At present, the turnover of Government employees is at the rate of 18 percent each year. When they leave the Government, what do they receive? They receive only the amount of money they contributed. The Federal contribution remains with the fund.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from South Carolina claim that the fund, on the present basis of operation, will not be bankrupt, according to the words of Mr. Macy, in 1990?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. Macy appeared before our committee. The committee has before it a bill to reform the financing of the retirement system that it will report to the Senate. It will be found that when the Government contributes to the fund, the contribution begins to draw interest. The Government borrows from the $14.5 billion in the fund and pays 3 percent interest, the lowest it pays anywhere in America.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I can only say that I am shocked and cannot believe that a sound argument can be made to justify the horrible condition that exists in the retirement fund. No words can refute the facts. No words can refute what every actuary will say about the present status of the fund.

If 2 years from now we again increase salaries, we shall further weaken the fund, unless we adopt a formula to provide for the base of annuities being established on the average salary received throughout the years.

I know I have used up my time. I have nothing further to say on the subject. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the only reason why the fund is not sound now is that the Government has failed to pay into it its proper share over the years. If 20, 25, or 30 years ago the Government had made its obligated contributions, the fund would be in sounder condition today.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The question may be irrelevant and immaterial; it may also be slightly unethical. But would not the result of the amendment of the Senator from Ohio be to reduce the pension of every Member of this body?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, it would not. It would not reduce the pension. It would allow the beneficiaries to receive the benefit of an increased pension without having in the past paid in a share of the premium adequate to sustain the fund.

My proposal would be absolutely just. It would be based on the average salary over the whole career of a Senator or of an employee of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I did not ask the Senator from Ohio; I asked the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. There are Members of this body who have served 28 or 30 years, when Members' salaries were lower their annuities at retirement age would be reduced substantially by this amendment. They would have to do this down through the years in order to get the $12,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I notice that the Senator from Pennsylvania asked questions only of those who will answer according to his wishes, but that comment might not be agreed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. There have been three versions of the amendment. The first one that came in would have made Members of the Senate exclusive victims of a rather deep cut in their retirement benefits, leaving out the legislative employees and leaving out the Government workers. This amendment was tabled on the opening of debate on the bill. Today, we have a new amendment which applies to the system-wide governmental retirement system. Frankly, I know of no established retirement system by industry, or others, which does not relate retirement pay for years of service which the worker has accumulated under a retirement system to the salary at the time he retires. To do otherwise would be to bring Mem-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

bers of the Senate back to the level of the $7,500 salary, for perhaps a fourth of their service, $10,000 for another fourth, and then perhaps up to $22,500. Today Members' salaries on which they pay 7½ percent retirement benefits is $22,500, contrary to the impression left by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Ohio, which I am sure he did not intend to create.

We pay the 7½ percent not on the $22,500, when the salary goes up, but on the $30,000. Those in the other grades would pay on their higher salaries. When we took this up in 1956, in order to be sure that we were not going to put in a lesser amount or too small an amount, we obtained an estimate from the Civil Service Commission as to the proper rate, and took the 5-year average. We were told we had to raise it from 6 to 7½ percent—which we did.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio will find that on November 1, 1956, in order to meet the 5-year average, we raised the assessments to 7½ percent.

By the same token, on Government employees, as their salaries have gone up, the percent has increased from the original rate of 2½ percent per year which was in effect on August 1, 1920, to 3½ percent which became effective on July 1, 1926, to 5 percent which became effective on July 1, 1942, to 6 percent which became effective on July 1, 1948, and to 6½ percent which became effective November 1, 1956.

I have heard it explained time and time again, that the purpose is to let the employee pay half the retirement, in much the same established custom as social security, which was modeled after this program.

The annual payment to the Commission, as civil service retirement, has done better than that, because the employee has paid more than his half. Although there is a deficit in the systemwide reserves on the entire civil service system, it is because the Government—in order to reach such political accommodations as "totaling" budgets in certain years—failed to put up, during those years, the portion that the Civil Service Commission intended, planned, and had under program. Those funds should have been invested. So it has been the Government, and not the employees, that has been shortchanging the fund. The employees have maintained their contributions and have increased their contributions.

To go back now and assent to pulling these men down to a 1920, a 1915, or a 1930 salary base, perhaps one-third of their employable time, and roll them back, rather than meet the salary which today—with inflation and the cost of living—the increase requires, would mean that 1.7 million civil service workers would go back, back, back, and would have their benefits greatly reduced.

I am surprised that the Senator, who has always been a friend of the Government worker, would do this to all Federal employees. If it was the original plan to do this to Senators and Representatives, we could perhaps stand it. It would be unfair—but we could stand it. But I do not believe it is the purpose to lower salaries back to the cost of living standard before World War II, which was low. But now, to roll them back and figure it in their base, means that the Government has not kept faith by putting its share of the money into the retirement fund.

I believe that this is an unwise amendment which would cause a great deal of distress among Government employees who have calculated for years on the basis of this high, 5-year average.

Now the Senator from Ohio comes in and with one swoop, in 1 day, reverses what he had on the table.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not reversing it at all. I have gone the full limit to be fair with all.

I might answer the Senator from Oklahoma by saying that I am the friend of the worker because I wish this fund to be kept sound. Those who are opposing my proposal are urging a course of action which would bankrupt the fund and eventually deprive every worker.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator well knows, or should know, that every year the Appropriations Committee is putting back more of the money of the Federal contribution.

Did the Senator from Ohio believe that the old base for the retirement system of Federal employees was going to be the employes contribution?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Never. The initial objective was to have it equally big.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Government has not carried out its contract.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It certainly has not paid into the fund.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct—that is why the fund is in the red.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But today we are going to put upon the Government a new obligation of $1,250 million, for which there has been no payment into the fund.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe that is going to freeze permanently all salaries in the system. I believe that there will always be a variation. When the worker increases his percentage to 7½ percent, that is about as high as any contributing employee can possibly go. Government workers are now paying 6½ percent. They are carrying their part of the load. If the congressional retirement to which the Senator has referred had been kept on a separate bookkeeping system, the Senator would find that since 1946 the fund collected more from the Members than was paid out.

The annual contribution of Members is $1,750,000. This does not include service credit, deposits, or voluntary contributions. Annuities paid out annually are $1,233,333, leaving an annual surplus on a cash basis of $416,000.

This is the way our congressional retirement system has worked. We do not like to retire early. No Member likes to retire at the earliest possible date in the Senate, nor in the House. So, we find that there are dozens of Members who serve long past the retirement-fund age, and continue to pay into the fund; and when they retire they draw back very much more than what they have been able to put in, without regard to the interest rate.

This amendment, I believe, would work great hardship on our Government employees. It has not been carefully thought out.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the position so effectively advocated by the Senator from Oklahoma in opposition to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The Federal employee is in no way responsible for the financial difficulties of the civil service retirement and disability fund. Indeed, it is the Federal Government which has created the deficit in this fund. The employee, since the act of origin in 1920, has contributed between 2½ percent, in the beginning, to 6½ percent of his gross salary to the retirement fund. It has been the Government which has failed again and again to contribute adequate funds. The Government made a promise and it has failed to live up to that promise. Do we therefore penalize the loyal Federal employee for Congress failure in breach of contract? I believe not, and I feel that the Members of the Senate will overwhelmingly defeat the pending amendment.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio speaks of Members of this Chamber who make $22,500 a year. I speak in behalf of 378,000 loyal workers in the Post Office Department who carry our mail and who earn a salary of slightly more than $5,000 a year.

I might be willing to accept the Senator's suggestion if the only persons involved were the Senator from Ohio and myself. We have, however, promised the Federal employees, the overwhelming majority of whom are in the lower grades of the Classification Act and the postal schedule, and it is these people we would hurt. It is these citizens who have earned a retirement based on "high 5" average and multiplied by their years of service.

I can never support a proposal to tell a clerk or stenographer or a letter carrier that after 25 or 30 or 40 years of toil, we will not pay that employee what we promised more than 40 years ago that we would pay.

Mr. MONRONEY. The argument of the Senator from West Virginia is valid. His conviction in this matter is appreciated.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President I should like to address a question, through the Senator from Oklahoma, to the Senator from Ohio. Does this apply to those presently on the rolls?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe the amendment is clear.

Mr. MORTON. To those presently on the retirement rolls.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has not provided for reducing those already on pension. It does not say.

Mr. MORTON. The point I wish to make is that a lady retired from my office after 17 years. She is retired now, and her pension is set, based on her highest 5 years of service. I have an-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

other employee who expects to retire, perhaps 3 years from now. Will those two employees be treated differently?

Mr. LAUSCHE. As to the one retired, her pay is fixed. It would not affect her at all.

Mr. MORTON. The first one was the beneficiary of the 5 highest years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes—over 5 years.

Mr. MORTON. She received retirement based on the highest 5 years. Should I treat someone differently from one who has worked for me and my predecessor, who has been on Capitol Hill since 1930, and give preferential treatment to someone who has worked for me, say, 15 years?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has now expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let the Chair put the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield time on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me read what Macy said:

> We find that in 7 years by 1972, the outgo in the form of benefit payments under the retirement act will exceed the income. From that date on, this unfavorable situation continues to add to the fund balance so that in 25 years, by 1990, the retirement fund balance is zero.
>
> I realize, Mr. Chairman, that this appears to be many years ahead, but we feel as the responsible administrators of this fund that we must look that far ahead.

We are going to continue on the way we are going, and run into this situation. Or we are going to meet the problem head on now.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield further, let me point out that provided Senators stand up and appropriate what they are supposed to appropriate to this fund, that contingency will not come about. What disturbs me is that someone who retired last year who worked for me or for some other Senator, or anyone on Capitol Hill, would be treated in one way under the amendment of the Senator, and persons who plan to retire in 2 or 3 or 4 years from now, or next year, will be treated in an entirely different way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Unless we find a remedy, the employee of the Senator who retires after working for 30 years will be in trouble. This employee of the Senator who retires, if she lives for 30 years, will be in trouble. But I do not suppose she will live that long.

Mr. MORTON. That is not because she worked for me.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Senator brought up a very important point. It would not be so effective as to Members of Congress. But, historically the Government employees off Capitol Hill have enjoyed the advantage of having the highest 5-year count for their retirement benefits. Suddenly, the Lausche amendment provides that people who retire subsequently will be subject to a different retirement pay. Those who come along after the passage of this amendment would be cut back to the Senator's example of the $5,000 a year clerk and the $2,000 a year clerk for 5 years. That would affect the average. Perhaps the person would be receiving a salary of $10,000 or $15,000 a year when he retired, but he would be entitled to only a third of the pay in the last 5 years that can be credited to his retirement.

I think it is a very cruel system to put into effect. It is very unwise. It is self-defeating.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the retirement system at best does not provide too large an annuity or pension to the pensioner. The pensioners on Government pensions, today, have a very difficult time, in many instances, meeting their expenses. It is very difficult for a person who is nearing $8,000, $7,000, $10,000, or $6,000 a year—a family person, even if a second person in the family works—to save up anything, except to possibly pay for a home to put Federal employees on two standards, one group whose retirement is based on the average of the last 5 years' earnings, and the other group on a different average would, I say most respectfully, not be proper.

I have not had the experience that the Senator from Ohio has in this matter. But I served on the teachers' retirement fund in my city, the municipal employees' retirement fund and the police and firemen's retirement fund. The only answer is to appropriate the money that we are obliged to appropriate.

What we did in most instances, and what Congress has done; namely, to take out a certain percentage of the worker's pay. Then Congress "takes it on the lam" and does not put up the money. If we do that, of course, the problem will not be solved. The only way to solve it is to have Congress perform its duty and provide its share of the funds.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I point out that the amount of raise that the workers will receive, with the 6½ percent that they will be paying in addition, will bring in something like $32 or $33 additional to the fund. It will stay in there for many years at 4 percent interest to help pay for this program. But the Government must put up its share, and be fair. To use the Government's failure as an excuse to tear down the amount that the workers will receive in 20 or 30 years, expecting and believing that they would receive it, I think, is a cruel system.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 2 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Ohio has pointed out that many annuitants are not in a position to maintain themselves the way they expected when they went on retirement.

I point out that many Members of the Senate are responsible for the plight of the retirees when they raise salaries 32 percent for the Members of the Senate, for judges, for board members, for board chairmen. We will take more and more bread out of the mouths of the annuitants.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks just made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If we want to penalize Federal employees who have served for years in this body, who have served in the Government for years, we should adopt the Lausche amendment.

If a Member of Congress is elected to Congress after 1956, in 6 years he can retire at full benefit, at the highest pay. But a Member who has served for many years, if we adopt the Lausche amendment, would receive much less in retirement. The same system would prevail in our Government.

I do not believe the Senate will adopt the amendment. I admit that Congress has been negligent in preserving this fund. It is our fault.

I have a statement, and instead of reading it, I would like to have it made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Annuity benefits under that system are based on years of service and the highest 5-year average salary. Annuities do not reflect the full effect of pay increases until such increases have been in effect 5 years. However, only about 10 percent of present employees will retire within the next 5 years, so it is apparent that a general increase in pay results in a material increase in the liabilities of the civil service retirement system. The Foreign Service retirement system is also affected, since the pending legislation proposes salary increases for members of that system.
>
> In its budget submission for fiscal year 1965, the Civil Service Commission estimated the unfunded liability of the civil service retirement system at about $33¾ billion as of June 30, 1964. The Commission estimates that pending pay legislation, if enacted, would increase this liability by $1¼ billion, raising it to $35 billion.
>
> I would like to emphasize that the increase of $1¼ billion is a onetime figure. It is not an annual amount, but is, in effect, an estimate of the present value of all future increases in benefits based on service performed prior to the pay increase. The cost of greater benefits for future service would be met by contributions of employees and their employing agencies, based on the higher salaries.
>
> One of the salient features of the civil service retirement system is the relationship of promised benefits to current pay levels. This is essential if the system is to fulfill its role in the personnel program of the Government. Justified pay increases carry with them justified increases in retirement benefits. The cost involved is a necessary and valid cost of operating the Government.
>
> The effect on the civil service retirement system of the pending pay legislation underscores the need for early consideration of methods to improve the financing of the System. In May 1963, the Commission submitted to Congress a proposal which would accomplish this objective by gradually increasing the contributions made by employing agencies until the growth of the unfunded liability had been arrested.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

I support proposed pay increases for officers and employees of the Federal Government because I am fully convinced of their justification and their need. I recognize their effect in necessarily increasing retirement liabilities, and I urge that this issue be squarly met by early adoption of a plan to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system.

Mr. CARLSON. I sincerely hope that the Senate will not be carried away and support the Lausche amendment. I also hope that we, as Members of the Senate, assume our responsibility and adopt the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission, submitted in the report to Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the amendment of the Civil Service Retirement Act embodied in the Lausche amendment, apply to all Federal employees, or only legislative?

Mr. CARLSON. It applies to everyone, postal workers, and everyone else.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am not on the particular subcommitee of which we are speaking, but I am on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, of the Appropriations Committee.

I would urge that Senators do not support this amendment. There is much that is available to Congress and the Members of the Senate. When that bill comes up, we can support putting an amount in that bill which will contribute to the fund and make it entire, and make it sound. That is the only logical way to go about it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the problem has been caused by the Congress of the United States, and by the administration when they failed to pay into the funds—not 1 year, but for many years, they refused to pay money into the fund to match that which was paid in by the employees.

That of course reduced the amount in the fund. That went on for many years. The House and the Senate during the war said that any soldier boy who went into the service would be given credit when he came out of the service on his civil service retirement without paying anything in, even if he were in for 3, 4, or 5 years. And the Government did not pay anything for them, either. One can see that builds a big deficiency in that field.

We have a bill at the present time, and we are making a study of it in the committee. It is recommended by the administration, and by the Civil Service Commission. It is expected to take care of the situation that we find ourselves in, as far as that is concerned. But the amendment which is pending before us at the present time is not equitable. It treats the people who have been in service many, many years unfairly. I hope it is voted down. I wish to submit this statement with respect to the bill, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal salary legislation has a direct effect upon the financial condition of the civil service retirement fund. Retirement annuities of Federal employees are computed on the basis of the employee's average salary over 5 years of employment at the highest salary he earns during his career. We call this the "high five" average. Naturally, increasing salaries automatically increases the "high five" average. In crediting the employee for past service at the time of retirement, the system gives the employee a benefit a certain portion of which he has not paid for.

As the Senate may know, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is presently considering legislation to improve permanently the financial condition of the fund. I am hopeful that favorable action will be taken on this legislation during this session of Congress. The deficit of the fund is caused by the Government's failure to contribute adequate funds in the past. Until the Retirement Act of 1956, a systematic method of agency contribution did not exist. The result has been a continuously growing unfunded liability.

This pay bill will add to that liability, but at the same time additional money will come into the fund because of the systematic contribution by both the agencies and the employees at the new, higher salary rates. When the Senate has an opportunity to act upon S. 1582, the funding legislation, a permanent method for improving the financial condition of the fund will be established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 6, nays 79, as follows:

No. 465 Leg.]

YEAS—6

Douglas	Lausche	Walters
Gore	Russell	Williams, Del.

NAYS—79

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morton
Allott	Hill	Moss
Anderson	Holland	Mundt
Bartlett	Humphrey	Muskie
Beall	Inouye	Nelson
Bennett	Jackson	Neuberger
Bible	Javits	Pastore
Boggs	Johnston	Pearson
Brewster	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Proxmire
Cannon	Kuchel	Randolph
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Case	Long, La.	Robertson
Church	Magnuson	Scott
Clark	Mansfield	Simpson
Cooper	McCarthy	Smith
Curtis	McClellan	Sparkman
Dirksen	McGee	Stennis
Dodd	McGovern	Symington
Dominick	McIntyre	Thurmond
Eastland	McNamara	Tower
Edmondson	Mechem	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Miller	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Monroney	
Hayden	Morse	

NOT VOTING—15

Bayh	Fong	Kennedy
Byrd, Va.	Fulbright	Saltonstall
Cotton	Goldwater	Smathers
Ellender	Hart	Talmadge
Engle	Hruska	Yarborough

So Mr. LAUSCHE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. I have an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 110, beginning with line 12, strike out through line 20 on page 111, as follows:

"(e) Section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(e)), is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$8,880' where it first appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,'; and

"(2) by striking out '$8,880' at the second place where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended'.

"(f)(1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

"(2) Clause 28(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

"(A) by striking out '$8,880' where it first appears in such clause and inserting in lieu

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,'; and

"(B) by striking out '$8,880' at the second place where it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

Redesignate subsections (g) to (k) as (e) to (i), inclusive.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of Members of the Senate and of the committee, I hope Senators may reach an agreement on this amendment without necessitating a rollcall. I speak as one who served for many years as a member of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, where, largely under the guidance, recently of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], but before that of Senator Styles Bridges and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], we worked for a long time in an effort to try to bring about an equitable relationship between the salaries paid employees of the House and those paid employees of the Senate.

Great progress has been made. Many sources of irritation have been eliminated.

For some strange reason, the bill now before the Senate raises those same sources of aggravation and irritation again, because, as will be noticed on page 17 of the committee report, in dealing with employees of the House of Representatives, a new maximum rate is established of $24,500. On the next page, dealing with the identical employees in the Senate, the new maximum rate is established of $22,945.

I am not arguing particularly whether the greater or the lesser amount is the logical one, but it will create nothing but unhappiness to have one rate established for House staff members and another rate for Senate staff members.

Personally, I am inclined to believe that the lower of the two rates would be the better decision in this instance, because it would keep them, percentagewise, in conformity with the increase of pay of Government employees generally; but whether the higher or the lower rate is fixed, it should be the same for both Houses.

My amendment would have the impact of cutting back the maximum House increase to the extent of the increase for Senate employees, and would put the matter in conference. The conference could either accept the Senate version or the House version, or a figure in between. The two certainly should be the same, to eliminate irritation and aggravation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. As the Senator well knows, having served on the Appropriations Subcommittee, the bills come over to the Senate without any figures for the Senate, after the House figures are fixed. The same is true in this bill. The bill came over with figures for the House employees which the House chose to put into the bill.

The committee went over the figures and came to the conclusion that the $24,500 top limitation provided for the House employees was too much. We felt it would be much better to have the lower figure.

Mr. MUNDT. And which the Senate has provided for Senate employees.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. However, we are not in a position to tell the House what it should do. We would only aggravate the Members of the House if the Senate told them what they should pay their top clerks or committee staff members. It so happens that their chief secretaries, who correspond to administrative assistants on the Senate side, receive lower pay. So there will always be that difference.

As a matter of comity, it would be well for the Senate not to try to tell the House what it should pay its employees. I hope it will take the cue from the Senate and adjust the figure downward.

Mr. MUNDT. There is quite a difference between adjudicating what the legislative subcommittee does, in which the Senate ought not to undertake to adjust what the House has done or try to interfere with the House functions, and fixing the rates under a law at two different levels, because the latter method would create an irritating and aggravating situation.

If my amendment were adopted, the Senate and the House conferees could arrive at either of the two figures or a figure in between.

To adopt the House language would not put the matter in conference without my amendment. There would be nothing to discuss. In effect, the pay scale for the House employees would be fixed at a different scale than for the Senate employees.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. There is much to be said for what the Senator from South Dakota has said as well as for what the Senator from Oklahoma has said. Traditionally the House has set the salaries of its own employees and the Senate has not interfered with it. But here the House has sent the Senate a bill in which the Senate has chosen to cut the top Senate salaries without the House having cut the top House salaries.

I see no great disturbance if the House salaries were cut down to the level of the Senate salaries. If there were an insistence on that level, the conferees could agree to it, or could come to another agreement. I see no great disturbance inasmuch as the Senate has taken unto itself to provide cuts for comparable positions.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate what the Senator has said. May I say to my peacefully inclined friends in the Senate that there is no way to stop the disturbance, because this matter will come back to plague us. If we let it remain as is, it is going to cause all sorts of irritation. I think we should face the issue now, accept the amendment, take it to conference, and work out something that is not inimical to all concerned, rather than not act and let the matter come back to plague us and create embarrassment and irritation.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I shall be glad to take this amendment to conference, but, having been in many conferences, I point out that the House Members are very touchy and sensitive. Senators know that. I cannot promise what the result will be, but I shall be glad to take it to conference.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in light of the action taken by the Senator from South Carolina, I have nothing to add. I think this difference should be in conference in some way. The difference should not exist. It is my hope that something can be arrived at, either at the higher or lower figure, or something in between, which will make the two scales comparable.

Mr. JOHNSTON. There should not be any difference between the two kinds of positions.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the service the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has performed in raising the question, and the Senator from South Carolina in accepting the amendment. I hope heed will be taken of what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has said. We hope the House will take the cue. However, nothing could be done about it at this time, unless, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has pointed out, an opportunity were given to do something about it by amending the provision in some way so that the matter can be considered further in conference. I think it is fair that it be done. I am grateful to both Senators for having made this possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the action of the Senator from South Carolina. I believe it was a wise decision to bring the matter to a head. As the author of the amendment I express the hope that the conferees on the part of the Senate will be able to induce the House to accept this pro rata increase, so that we can continue the matter on an equitable basis. I hope the conferees will not discontinue their negotiations until such time as there has been an equalization and a parity of relationship established between salaries of employees of both bodies.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I had prepared a statement on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CARLSON

There is one other point I would like to mention. That is the variation between pay for House committee staff members and the Senate committee staff members.

A House committee, under the current law has only one base pay for House committee employees. That base pay is $8,880, and is not mandatory.

The language in the new House bill, H.R. 11049, lifted that base and permits the chairman of a House committee to set committee salaries not to exceed a gross of $24,500.

In the Senate, under the current law, the base pay is for one committee employee at

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

$8,880, two committee employees at $8,460, three committee employees at $8,040.

The top base pay in a Senator's office for his staff is the same as the top base pay on a Senate committee, $8,880—also, the other employees in a Senator's office are set up on a base pay schedule.

In reporting H.R. 11049, the Senate committee used the same formula for pay increases as did the House committee. But, since the House committee had only a base of $8,880, under previous legislation, the House language of the bill lifted that pay and permits a committee chairman to pay a gross salary not to exceed $24,500 for committee staff employees. Where a base pay structure is used, that gross salary would require a base pay of about $9,475.

Since the Senate employees are paid on a base salary, the entire Senate pay structure would have needed to be revised.

The Senate committee, therefore, chose to use the House formula but, did not change the base pay schedule—this means that the top employee on a House committee might draw more gross pay than the top employee on a Senate committee, or a top employee in a Senator's office. That is because the base pay—the top—of $8,880, under the formula used gives a gross salary of $22,945.

I would not want to infringe upon the privilege of the House to set up its own pay structure. However, it does seem to me that these pay structures should be brought closer together even if the Senate pay structure of base pay were necessarily revised

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has been yielded back or has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 164, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "$43,000," and insert in lieu thereof "$38,000"; on line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$42,500," and insert in lieu thereof "$37,500."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators, I am prepared to make a reasonably short statement, with the hope that the Senate can vote on the amendment shortly. There is nothing complicated about the amendment. It is merely an attempt to bring into some semblance of equity a situation of inequity which has existed for some time; namely, the inequity between the salaries of members of the Supreme Court and the salaries of the Members of Congress and members of the Cabinet.

As we all know, at the present time the salary of Associate Justices of the Supreme Court is $35,000 and of the Chief Justice $35,500. Both the Senate committee and the House committee have proposed to raise these salaries to $42,500 for Associate Justices and to $43,000 for the Chief Justice. The next highest judicial salaries are for the Court of Appeals, which are boosted to $33,000.

This body has resorted to more self-flagellation in the last few days than I have heard in a long time. I am not proud of the things which have happened in the past few months, and which have brought so much discredit upon this body. I do not believe that Members of the Senate have brought that discredit upon themselves. Therefore, I shall not discredit myself or Members of the Senate with respect to the service we render, and demean ourselves with respect to the Supreme Court. Neither do I offer the amendment in the spirit of criticism of the decisions of the Supreme Court.

I have always thought, and I think now, that the difference between the $22,500 and the $35,000 salary is out of all proportion to the services rendered, the intelligence required, the skill required, and the responsibility that Members of Congress must assume every day and that the members of the Supreme Court must assume.

I do not concede that they bear a greater responsibility. I do not concede that it requires a higher sense of integrity. I do not concede that they have to work harder. None of these things is true.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ALLOTT. What I propose is an increase of $2,500 for the Justices of the Supreme Court, which would still leave them a salary $7,500 higher than a Member of Congress receives.

There is a reluctance upon the part of Senators to discuss where they actually come out in their salary. I point out two or three things. First, there is not a Member of the Senate who makes as much as his administrative assistant. If there is, I should like to have him stand and tell me that he does. We are involved in trips home, political responsibility, entertainment of constituents, and a thousand other items. We are constantly pressed to make donations to this and contributions to that. It becomes a very great burden.

The Supreme Court is exempt from most of these things. The Justices do not have to maintain two homes. They do not have to make trips back home. They sit here in a home of their own, and they do not bear the expenses that we must bear every day.

It would appear now that our salary has been raised to $30,000. However, I will wager that there is not a Member of the Senate who will have 50 percent of that left for himself to live on, when everything is toted up.

That is not the case with members of the Supreme Court. They are here for life. Seven and a half percent of our salary goes into the retirement fund, and we earn it. We get what we have earned of that 7½ percent at the time the good people of our State decide to retire us or we retire ourselves.

With the Supreme Court it is different altogether. They have life tenure, and their salaries continue completely until they die. They contribute not 1 cent to a pension fund.

Therefore, the compensation of the members of the Supreme Court is far above that of a Senator, even if the salary of the Senator is fixed at $30,000.

I have not sought to slap them in the face, or anything of that sort. I am trying to bring some semblance of equity into the situation between the salaries, to reflect in the minds of the people of this country, to some extent, the responsibilities which we bear. We have an opportunity to indicate how Senators feel about the importance of their jobs. Apparently we have fixed the salaries of Senators. I think we should fix the salaries of the Supreme Court Justices in the same way.

Does the Senator from Rhode Island wish some time?

Mr. PASTORE. No. I merely held up my two fingers. It was not a sign of victory but to show that we must maintain two homes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for offering his amendment, which I think should be adopted. It should be remembered that the Congress is a coordinate branch in our tripartite system of government with the Supreme Court of the United States. It should be further noted that Members of Congress are responsible to the people they serve. They are elected by those people, and are accountable to them. The Supreme Court is not. It should be further noted that since the Supreme Court seems to reason it should legislate and amend the Constitution, perhaps members of the Supreme Court should receive a salary no higher than that received by the legislators.

Mr. ALLOTT. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment. It is, of course, difficult to try to appraise the proper salaries for all the members of the executive department or all the members of the Supreme Court, and the other parts of the judiciary. The committee spent much time trying to determine what it believed was fair and equitable in the light of the responsibilities, the importance, and the constitutional duties of the three branches of the Government.

We are likely to err in many ways; but I hardly feel that this is the time to downgrade the Supreme Court by bringing the salaries which are proposed in the bill—$42,500 for the members and $43,000 for the Chief Justice—below that level. What is proposed in the bill is a simple addition of a $7,500 stepup, such as Congress is about to vote itself to the $30,000 figure.

I think the most controlling point that led to the $30,000 figure is that the salaries of Members of Congress is about on a level with those of U.S. district judges. Our salaries have traditionally been compared with the salaries of district judges.

As the Senator from Colorado has said, the salaries of district judges will become $30,000, as will the congressional salaries. The salaries of circuit judges will be $33,000. These increases are stepups toward the salaries of members of the Supreme Court, which is the highest court of all.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

The Supreme Court is composed of only nine members. The increase does not involve a great impact on the budget. I feel that with the great volume of work and the very important function of the Supreme Court, whether we always agree with their opinions or not, the members of the Court are entitled to the salary proposed in the bill—$42,500 for the members and $43,000 for the Chief Justice.

As we have said countless times, we are not applying the salary to the man. The salary goes with the position. We hope that by paying an adequate salary, we will continue to draw the very best persons to all branches of the Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial.

I believe that the alinement of salaries of judges, as we have provided in the bill, is right and proper. I would dislike to see those salaries changed at this time without any further justification than has been made.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall be brief and shall yield back the remainder of my time when I have concluded.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma. I know they are made in all good faith.

The Supreme Court is now in recess and will be in recess until October. That tells a good story in itself.

So far as concerns the ability that is required for positions on the Supreme Court, I can think of at least two dozen Members of the Senate who, I am sure, would grace the Supreme Court and would even add luster to it. So, while it may be invidious to compare abilities, I say that there are Members of the Senate who could and would be a credit to the Supreme Court.

I cannot understand the argument that the salaries of Supreme Court Justices should be raised $10,000 over the salaries of members of the courts of appeals. That is unreasonable. Let Senators try to reason it out with their constituents when they return home. Let them try to reason with their constituents the payment of $43,000 a year to Supreme Court Justices, when all they have to do is stay in Washington the entire year round, and take a vacation every summer.

Three branches of our Government are established by the Constitution. One is the executive, at the other end of the avenue. Another is this body. The third branch is the judiciary. The Lord willing, not one of those branches will ever dominate this Government. They are coequal. There is nothing that indicates that the Supreme Court is of greater importance or is worth more than the Members of this branch of the Government or the members of the executive branch. We need to remember that they are equal, and that if we provide salaries of $37,500 for the Justices and $38,000 for the Chief Justice, we shall be more than evidencing our generosity and more than evidencing the fact that we are a coequal branch of the Government.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. Congress puts itself on a lower plane than it ought to be on when it makes so great a difference between the salaries of Senators and Representatives and the salaries of members of the Supreme Court. The members of the Supreme Court have a vacation of about 3 months a year. If a Senator has a vacation, I have never found out when it comes.

I have served as a member of an appellate court. I appreciate the importance of the work of such courts. But Members of the Senate and House have to work all the time. They have campaign expenses. The members of the Supreme Court never run for office; they hold their offices for life. Automobiles are furnished them at the expense of the Government. They pay nothing toward their retirement; and they can retire at full pay at the age of 70. It is my understanding that they pay nothing toward the retirement benefits for their wives.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The members of the Supreme Court do pay for the retirement benefits of their wives, but not for themselves.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. While they make contributions for the retirement benefits of their wives, they make none for themselves. They can retire at full pay at age 70 without making a single contribution toward their own retirement. Congress places itself on a plane lower than it should be when it makes such great discrepancies between the emoluments of its Members and those of members of the Supreme Court. It is likewise unwise to make such differentials between the pay of members of the courts of appeals and the district courts and the pay of the members of the highest court of the land.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

GEN. WILLIAM F. McKEE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last Tuesday the able Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] paid tribute to a distinguished American, Gen. William Fulton McKee, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, who will retire July 31, 1964.

I was not here at that time, and want to take this occasion to add a word of appreciation for the many years General McKee devoted to the service of his country. Beginning with graduations from West Point and the Coast Artillery School, the general's 35-year career is marked by an outstanding degree of competence, integrity, and loyalty.

During my days with the Air Force, General McKee was of invaluable assistance. His ability to analyze and solve problems and to work out solutions which saved the Government money, with fewer man-hours, impressed us time and time again.

The country has been fortunate to be the beneficiary of this man's many talents. It is a privilege to take this opportunity to express deep appreciation for all he has done for his country, and to wish him and his gracious wife the best of everything in his retirement.

LOUIS B. McGEE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a few days ago the people of Missouri lost one of their outstanding citizens—Louis B. McGee.

Louis McGee probably had as many friends as anyone in my State. This was because of his warm and delightful personality; and also because of the effective manner in which he worked for the betterment of the people of his community, his State, and the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an article and an editorial published in the Kansas City Times, the latter entitled "Louis B. McGee."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times, June 15, 1964]

LOUIS B. McGEE, 62, IS DEAD IN ARIZONA—INSURANCE MAN AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER APPARENTLY HAD HEART ATTACK—ACTIVE IN MANY FIELDS—HE WAS KNOWN AS A PARTY FUNDRAISER AND BOOSTER OF ROCKHURST COLLEGE

Louis B. McGee, insurance executive and civic and Democratic politcal leader, died yesterday in Scottsdale, Ariz. He was 62.

He apparently suffered a heart attack during the morning while resting in his room at the Mountain Shadows resort.

When Mr. McGee did not appear for a luncheon date with Frederick G. Betts, a former Kansas Citian, Betts went to McGee's room and found the body on the bed.

A HEART VICTIM

Mr. McGee had been in Arizona about 6 weeks. He had been afflicted with arthritis in recent years and had suffered heart attacks previously.

Mr. McGee was a partner in the firm of Thomas McGee & Sons and was treasurer and a director of the Old American Insurance Co.

He was born in San Francisco in 1902. His father, Thomas McGee, established the insurance firm in Kansas City in 1910. Thomas McGee died in 1953.

As a business leader in Kansas City, Louis McGee served in many civic organizations, served the Catholic Church in various capacities and was a nationally active member of the Democratic Party.

Of his service to the city, Former Mayor H. Roe Bartle said last night:

"Kansas City and the State of Missouri have lost a real participating citizen of the highest order. Louis McGee always had a progressive spirit and a willingness to work for the city in many, many activities. He was an effective leader who did not want credit for the work he did."

CITED AS A BUILDER

"He was a strengthening force in our program of international relations and trade with Latin America. Kansas City has lost one of its real builders."

An alumnus of Rockhurst College, McGee was presented the institution's pro meritis

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

award in 1960. He was cited as "a rare man who can organize as well as execute. He has given time and again of his energy and experience for worthy projects."

Mr. McGee served as chairman of the Rockhurst board of regents from 1957 to 1959 and later was chairman of the community relations committee of the board.

CITED AS A GIVER

He was a past president of the Council of Catholic Men, a member of the advisory board of St. Mary's Hospital, and a contributor to numerous charities and organizations.

In the Democratic Party he served as a fund raiser and promotional worker for party events. He was active in the Adlai Stevenson presidential campaigns and was a friend of Stevenson. On the county level he worked with all factions of the party.

Mr. McGee was a bachelor who each year was host for a reunion of the McGee family. At an Easter reunion this year 158 members of the clan gathered at the Old American Building at Volker Boulevard and Oak Street.

In World War II he served in the Coast Guard from 1942 to 1945.

He was a Knight of St. Gregory, appointed in 1948 by Pope Pius XII.

A HOSPITAL DIRECTOR

He served as finance officer of the department of Missouri of the American Legion from 1945 to 1949, was a member of the downtown committee of the chamber of commerce, of the White House Committee on Education Beyond the High School Level, was a past president of the Armed Forces Council, and a director of the Kansas City General Hospital and Medical Center.

He was vice president of the Kansas City Commission for International Relations and Trade, a member of the board of governors of the American Royal, the committee for study of higher education of the State of Missouri, the capital improvements commission of Jackson County, the Kansas City Club, and the Carriage Club.

Mr. McGee lived at 5049 Wornall Road.

Surviving are two brothers, Joseph J. McGee, Sr., 5405 Wornall, and Frank McGee, 635 West Meyer Boulevard, and three sisters, Mrs. Catherine M. Soden, 6848 Cherry; Mrs. Jerome J. Burke, 433 West 69th; and Mrs. John R. Lillis, 4545 Rockhill Road, and 21 nieces and nephews.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times, June 16, 1964]

LOUIS B. McGEE

To walk with Louis B. McGee through a hotel lobby in downtown Kansas City was a heartwarming experience. It also involved slow progress because Louis McGee, the friendliest of men, knew so many people. He had to pause and chat with everyone he recognized. Always he had a quip or a story. For strangers there would be a big smile.

But his affable manner was only one part of Louis McGee's makeup. He was a constructive, effective civic leader. "Let's get it done" and "Why wait?" were his usual quick responses when someone spoke of problems obstructing a goal. Being imaginative and progressive, Louis McGee usually could see a way to overcome the problems. He could persuade people to work together and like it.

Kansas City business knew Louis McGee as a partner in the large McGee insurance interests founded by his father, the late Thomas McGee. Louis McGee was the company's public contact man and there was none more astute. But he spent as much or more time on widely ranging civic interests as he did on his business career. Louis McGee developed a great zest for politics. His keen mind became a factor in the strategy and financing of the Democratic Party.

Mr. McGee was an outstanding lay leader of the Catholic Church. Rockhurst College was a special interest. He served that Jesuit institution as chairman of the board of regents and as the driving force in numerous college projects. A bachelor, Louis McGee was devoted to the numerous clan McGee and delighted in the family reunions he personally organized.

Louis B. McGee spent the last third of his 62 years in physical suffering. But he was never known to complain. Prolonged illness never made a dent in his courage or his energy. Louis McGee, fine and generous-spirited citizen that he was, accomplished a great deal for Kansas City.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, when the editorial says "Louis McGee, fine and generous-spirited citizen that he was, accomplished a great deal for Kansas City," that is only too true.

Louis McGee was the kind of citizen who can never be replaced—his personal charm, his gracious manner, his consistent effectiveness when it came to carrying out constructive community plans and programs.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent also that a memorial broadcast from Station KCMO in Kansas City be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOUIS B. McGEE

Missouri and Kansas City will be a long time recovering from the loss of Citizen Louis B. McGee. He was a natural. Everything held unusual interest to the personable insurance executive, and it was his exceptional interest in the world around him that must have led McGee into the multitude of State and community activities where his image became a permanent impression. Few men have such a rare ability to give outstanding service to so wide a variety of activities. Louis McGee was equally effective in veterans affairs as in top-level business activities or within his church. Although he held no public office, he was the kind of man whose interest in people could easily have been a dominant force in government. Instead of seeking office, McGee turned his tremendous organizational ability to the political party of his choice. Many a candidate can see the McGee touch in whatever success emerged from the campaign; Senators, Governors, and even Presidents sought out McGee for the kind of practical assistance that was touched with genius at times.

There are those who recall Louis McGee's straight-forward approach to problems, how on many occasions a deadlocked meeting was put back on the track with the down-to-earth advice from the affable insurance man. We can't vouch for the absolute quotation attributed to McGee about his friendliness yet we suspect it is true that he remarked, "With a clan as big as the McGees, you have to know how to get along with everyone." He showed every indication of the truth of this statement. To know Louis McGee was indeed a valued experience. It was difficult not to know him if one had the chance to meet up with him. Perhaps this personal magnetism spilled over into his community and State associations. Not an opportunity was lost by this man to show enthusiasm for his home grounds wherever he went whether to Washington or to foreign lands. Kansas City and Missouri need many more Louis B. McGees.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, beyond all else, Louis McGee was loyal; loyal to his friends, loyal to his church, loyal to his country. We who were devoted to him shall sorely miss him.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the senior Senator from Missouri about Mr. McGee, who was a good friend of mine and was one of the outstanding citizens of Kansas City.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able colleague. I know he was devoted to Mr. McGee, and Mr. McGee was also devoted to him.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the remaining time yielded back?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 40, as follows:

[No. 466 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Allott	Hill	Robertson
Anderson	Holland	Russell
Bennett	Johnston	Simpson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Smith
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Sparkman
Church	Lausche	Stennis
Curtis	Long, La.	Symington
Dodd	Mansfield	Thurmond
Dominick	McClellan	Tower
Eastland	McGovern	Walters
Ervin	Mechem	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Goldwater	Mundt	Young, Ohio
Gore	Pearson	
Gruening	Prouty	

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

NAYS—40

Bartlett	Humphrey	Morse
Beall	Inouye	Morton
Bible	Jackson	Moss
Boggs	Javits	Muskie
Brewster	Keating	Nelson
Burdick	Kuchel	Neuberger
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Pastore
Case	Magnuson	Pell
Clark	McCarthy	Proxmire
Cooper	McGee	Ribicoff
Dirksen	McIntyre	Scott
Douglas	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Edmondson	Metcalf	
Hartke	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—14

Bayh	Fong	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Hart	Smathers
Cotton	Hayden	Talmadge
Ellender	Hruska	Yarborough
Engle	Kennedy	

So Mr. ALLOTT's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1092.

I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

The amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] reads as follows:

On page 167, line 2, insert the following:

"TITLE VI—DISCLOSURE OF OUTSIDE ASSETS AND EARNINGS

"SEC. 601. On April 15, 1965, and annually thereafter, every Member, officer, and employee of Congress, whose gross congressional compensation is $10,000 or more, shall file with the Comptroller General in accordance with such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Comptroller General: (1) a statement of any financial interest having a value of $5,000 or more in any activity subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency; (2) a statement of the amount and source of all compensation and income which he has received from outside sources in excess of $100. Such statements filed with the Comptroller General shall be held as public records and shall be available for public access thereto at any time during the regular business hours of the office of the Comptroller General.

"SEC. 602. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no increase in compensation for any Member, officer, or employee of Congress provided in this Act shall be paid after April 15 of each year until such Member, officer, or employee has filed the statements required by section 601 of this Act."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Presiednt, I yield myself 5 minutes. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we know what the amendment is? We do not know what it is.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be glad to explain it. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator explain what the amendment is?

Mr. KEATING. I planned to be very brief, but I can be longer if the majority leader insists on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We do not know what the yeas and nays are for.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it might be called a little Morse amendment. I shall point out the difference between this and the Morse amendment. The principal difference is that the Morse amendment was a full disclosure amendment. I supported the Morse amendment. I regret that it did not pass. But this is only a partial disclosure amendment.

This amendment adds a conflict of interest title to the bill. It requires all Members, officers, and employees of Congress whose compensation is $10,000 or more to annually file statements of all financial interests of $5,000 or more in activities subject to Federal regulation and a statement of the amount and source of all outside income in excess of $100. This should be a minimum prerequisite to any action on a congressional salary increase.

One of the reasons the prestige of Congress has fallen in the eyes of the public is our refusal to come to grips with the problem of conflict of interest. Year in and year out proposals are introduced, but no action is taken. Once again in this session we have had a number of bills introduced, and yet there is no assurance that this Congress will adopt such legislation despite the public's wide support for a legislative code of ethics.

I know that most Members of Congress are conscientious, dedicated public servants. But a few bad cases can cause immense damage to the whole institution. My objective is to build up, not weaken, public confidence in the legislative branch, and I am convinced that this can best be done if Congress demonstrates a willingness to set its own house in order.

Nothing weakens confidence in Government as much as the appearance of favoritism, inside dealings, and the use of public office for personal economic advantage. The public suspicion of the existence of misuse of office because of our failure to adopt conflict-of-interest legislation weakens confidence as much as actual misdeeds.

It has never been more important then it is today—when we are engaged in a life and death struggle with tyranny—to maintain confidence in our Government and to strengthen the moral fiber of our Nation. Even though the abuses are infrequent, the danger from low ethical standards in any branch of government has never been more serious.

Conflict-of-interest legislation is designed to encourage confidence in the operation of government. Obviously, there is as much need for promoting such confidence in the workings of Congress as in any other branch of government.

Congress has been willing to impose standards of ethics on the members of the executive branch. It is important that we repudiate the impression that we are following a double standard by now adopting legislation applicable to ourselves and our employees. It is the most effective step we can take to restore lagging public confidence.

Members of Congress are the only group in the present bill who are not required to be full-time employees. Whatever may have been the situation originally, anyone who accepts service in Congress or as an employee of Congress should do so with an awareness that it probably will be a full-time commitment.

This amendment is directed toward the accomplishment of two purposes. It is an acknowledgement that service as a Member, officer, or employee of Congress is virtually a full-time job. The disclosure provisions will make it apparent whether we are giving it full-time service or, if not, to what extent. Secondly, by requiring disclosure of assets and outside income by those who receive more than $10,000 a year we are closing a conflict gap. It will be readily apparent whether one is taking advantage of a public trust to benefit himself. Of all the proposals which have been made, this one appears most closely related to determining whether Members of Congress are giving the kind of time and attention to their duties which would merit a raise in pay.

The other primary difference between the Morse amendment and this one—and I am shortening this as I know it is the desire of Senators to get on with the work—the other primary difference is that this one is self-executing. In order to obtain the increase in pay, it is necessary to file the required statement. Under the Morse amendment, there were penal provisions. A fine and imprisonment were provided for failure to file, or for filing a false statement. There is no such provision here.

However, it does provide that in order to get the increase, one must file with the Comptroller General in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe.

I could go into more detail if necessary.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this amendment seeks what we have been trying to have enacted for a long time. It merely requires what many of us voluntarily do already; namely, file a record of our investments and the principal source of our income. It leaves it to the public to decide whether there are conflicts of interest for which we should be taken to task.

It is the simplest and most proper way to deal with the many ethical questions. Many persons have worked on this problem. I am personally grateful to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] for having an opportunity to join with him in it.

I think it is very worthy of approval by the Senate. It is self-operative. It commends itself very highly by all standards, as the proper way in which a Senator should account to his constituents.

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. PASTORE. Does one have to file with the Comptroller General whether he does or does not?

Mr. KEATING. It requires filing only if one is to receive it.

Mr. PASTORE. How does that work out so that one can get his raise? One has to file that he does. Does he not have to file that he does not? Otherwise, how does one get his raise?

Mr. KEATING. This amendment provides that one must file a statement of any financial interest in one of these activities, and a statement of the amount and source of income received from outside sources. That part is the same as in the Morse amendment. A statement to the disburser's office that one held no such holdings and received no such outside income would probably be sufficient. One would not be required to file such a statement, but there would be nothing to prevent one from filing it.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not mean to be critical. But I think there is an awkwardness in the statement that ought to be clarified. I think if before one can receive the increase, he has to file a statement, he should have to file a statement to the effect that he does not have such interest. Otherwise, I do not see how it would work out. The Senator is making it conditioned upon his getting the increase in salary.

And yet it would provide that only those who have an interest must file. If that is so, how would the Comptroller know? How would the disbursing office know, unless we were to say so in the amendment?

Mr. KEATING. I think I shall have to explain the amendment in greater detail to the Senator.

The amendment would provide, in the first section, that on April 15, 1965, and annually thereafter, every Member, officer, and employee of Congress whose gross congressional compensation is $10,000 or more shall file the two required statements with the Comptroller General; and in the next section it is provided that no increase in compensation for any such Member, officer, or employee shall be paid after April 15, of each year, until the Member has filed the statements required by the first section.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator elaborate on what is meant by filing a statement of the amount and source of all compensation and income which he has received from outside sources in excess of $100?

Mr. KEATING. I do not know how to make it more explicit.

Mr. CURTIS. It would include everything?

Mr. KEATING. It would include everything.

Mr. CURTIS. Wages?

Mr. KEATING. Wages.

Mr. CURTIS. Dividends?

Mr. KEATING. Dividends.

Mr. CURTIS. Interest?

Mr. KEATING. Interest.

Mr. CURTIS. That is all included?

Mr. KEATING. That is correct. In that regard, it is like the Morse amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Would this be a public record?

Mr. KEATING. It is provided in the next sentence that such a statement shall be held as a public record and be available for access to the public.

Mr. GOLDWATER. How would the States that have community property laws be affected in that situation? Would not one have to report his wife's income, too?

Mr. KEATING. I suppose if one had any financial interest in an activity that was subject to a regulatory agency, whether one had it individually, or as a part of the community property, one would have to report it. Although, it does provide that he shall file a statement with the Comptroller General in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General.

I would assume also that he would be able to eliminate community property, if he saw fit.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would it be proper, in your opinion, to elimnate the community property?

Mr. KEATING. I think a person who has any financial interest in an activity subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency, no matter how he acquired that interest, should file such a statement.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is one of the questions in my mind about the entire reporting argument. Does not the Senator think that in any reporting legislation that is passed, it should be required that income of the whole family, the wife, father, mother, brothers, and sisters should be reported? In my family, my wife has an income outside of what I can provide. The same applies to my mother. If we are to be suspect of devious thinking in this body, I think we can consider our families.

Mr. KEATING. First, I do not believe any Member of this body is to be suspect of devious thinking. However, we have already debated an amendment like the one to which the Senator refers. I supported that amendment. I agree with the Senator in that regard. But the amendment was not adopted.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if what the Senator has proposed would not have the practical effect of requiring every Senator to apply in writing to become eligible for the pay increase, in which case he would have stolen a leaf out of a chapter of the Senate Building Commission, which provided the rugs for the private offices of Senators. We required each Senator to apply for a rug. Some Senators got them, some did not. If that is what the Senator is asking, it should be made clear. The Senator is asking each Senator to say "I qualify for the pay increase. I wish to put in my application."

Mr. KEATING. The amendment does not have anything to do with rugs.

Mr. MUNDT. It has to do with the proposed pay increase.

Mr. KEATING. The amendment provides that a Senator will get the increase if he files the required statement with the Comptroller General. It is very simple. Admittedly it does not go as far as the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] sought to go in his amendment, which I was happy to support. But it would be a first step in laying the cards on the table as to holdings of Members of Congress.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I know what the Senator has in mind, but I am thinking of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we cannot hear a word that is being said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. ALLOTT. What the Senator had in mind is that people who have income from activities such as electric companies, power companies, and things like that that go over State lines would be required to report it. But there is almost no business in our country today that is exempt from the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. So in the manner in which the amendment is written, the Senator's amendment would place in that category even grocery stores and supply houses within a State.

Mr. KEATING. No; that is the reason for the provision in the amendment that the activity shall be subject to regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General. In other words, the Comptroller General would determine what was covered by the phrase "regulatory agency." I agree with the Senator that to a degree any corporation in almost any line of business could be said to be subject to some regulatory agency. As good an illustration as any is the one that the Senator has stated—the Federal Trade Commission. Although the determination would be left to the Comptroller General to make the final decision, it is not my intention, and I wish to state this as a part of the legislative history, that it apply to interests in all types of business activity. Specifically, it should apply to, in my judgment, holdings in radio and television companies and holdings in companies under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and the ICC, such as interstate pipeline companies, railroads, motor carriers, water carriers, freight forwarders, and so forth. There is no reason why those covered by the amendment could not hold such interests, but if they do hold them, it seems to me that they should be a matter of public record.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes under the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If anything, the amendment of the Senator from New York is worse than the Morse proposal. If a Senator had income or compensation from outside sources amounting to $100, he would be required to report everything he receives.

If a Senator owned some stock in a company under regulation by a Federal agency, he would come under the purview of the amendment. A Senator could own shares in General Motors and escape the provisions of the amendment. He could not own an interest in a power

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

company and escape. He could own 100 shares of Caterpillar Corp. and be outside the purview of the amendment, but if he should own 100 shares of Columbia Gas, he would be on the inside.

Mr. President, the amendment makes less sense to me than the Morse amendment. In addition, the amount at which a Senator would report would be reduced to $100.

We have heard that the amendment contains no penalty clause. Certainly not. It would be self-enforcing. If loss of a $7,500 pay increase is not a penalty, I give up. That is true particularly if one has a conviction as to whether the proposed procedure is the way to go about policing the world's greatest deliberative body.

Mr. President, the amendment ought to be roundly defeated.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the minority leader. If anything, the amendment is worse than the Morse amendment. I hope the Senate will vote it down as it voted down that amendment and another amendment.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in this world of modern merchandising the old adage that you get what you pay for still applies. And it applies equally well to the process of government. There is no doubt in my mind that the civil servants of the United States of America, much maligned by both innocent and vicious jest and held up to undeserved ridicule, are performing valuable and efficient service for the people of our Nation.

The legislation we are considering today would raise the pay of these civil servants. I support this increase in salary for several reasons. In the first place, I do not believe that Government service should be a form of economic second-class citizenship. Those who work for the Government should be paid on a scale comparable to similar jobs in private industry. This is not simply equitable treatment but is the only policy by which we can attract and keep the best qualified and most dedicated people.

There are millions of Americans whose dedication is such that they are quite willing to make sacrifices, both economic and personal, in order to serve their Nation. And in many instances we have called upon them to make those sacrifices. But now, in the midst of an onrushing prosperity with all economic indicators setting new records as a matter of course, it is an inequitable and penurious government that will not provide adequate salaries for those it employs.

The results of existing niggardly pay rates are now being felt throughout the ranks of Government, and especially in the higher management levels, as many men find that, in consideration of the needs of their families, they must take higher paying jobs outside of Government. Mr. President, it is a poor form of economy indeed to replace efficient and effective workers with less efficient personnel because we are unwilling to pay a decent wage.

It is a curious thing that many of those who are the most vitriolic in their criticisms of the Federal Government and of those who work for it and who complain the most about the type of service provided by the Government are the same people who are opposed to any increase in Federal salaries. Many of these people have found that the Government which they so detest has provided an economic climate which has enabled them to make a very comfortable living for themselves and for their families. These people often are intimately acquainted with the tenets of employment in the business world and are prepared to pay top prices for the talent they need to make their enterprise a success. This is what is called good business. But when the Government attempts the same thing, it is—in their minds—boondoggling and bureaucracy. Well, to paraphrase an old quotation, what is good business for business is good business for the Government.

One of the most controversial aspects of this legislation is that which concerns proposed salary increases for Members of the Congress. I realize full well, Mr. President, that too many people think our salaries are already too high. The hidden costs of congressional service are not apparent to many people, but I have yet to talk to a Senator or Congressman who is able to salt away any appreciable amount of his salary for those proverbial rainy days. The pinch is especially felt by those of us from the West who find that the jet airplane is the one way of providing the best service and establishing the best and closest relationships with our constituents but is also a rather expensive means of commuting. I believe that this salary increase is completely in line with the increasing cost of living and is commensurate with the duties and obligations of the office we hold.

But, in accepting the necessity for this salary increase, I believe we must also accept the reality of space-age government. And that is the reality that governing the most powerful and richest nation in this complex time is a full-time occupation. We have in recent years discovered that our adjournment dates regularly approach the winter solstice, but we cling to the idea that this is an abnormal situation. Mr. President, I believe that we must finally accept the fact that the Senate is a full-time, year-round job. And that the sooner we learn to live with that fact, the sooner will we be in a position to develop more orderly legislative processes.

Mr. President, I believe that among the obligations held by a Member of the Congress is the obligation to afford his constituents the knowledge that he is serving them without conflicts of interest and in the best interests of the State and Nation. Those who receive their employment in the higher echelons of Government with our "advice and consent" are required by us to be free of conflict of interest. It is only just that we are equally free from such conflicts.

Mr. President, I have already outlined my contention that a congressional pay raise is not undeserved. But if we are going to take the action of increasing our own pay, I think it behooves us—at the same time—to indicate that we are keenly aware of our responsibility to avoid even the suspicion of conflict of interest. In order that we approach this pay increase in good conscience, I would hope that each of us would reveal publicly his outside financial holdings and other sources of income.

I do not believe for one moment that such an action would embarrass any Senator. I know that some of my colleagues have had distinguished careers in other fields and can be justifiably proud of their success and equally reluctant to reveal its details to the public. However, we are not in the position of a private individual. We have accepted a public trust and, to hold to that trust, we must take positive action to demonstrate that we honor that commitment. A disclosure of our financial holdings is such a positive action.

Mr. President, in light of these beliefs, I made, on April 3, 1963, a full disclosure of my financial situation. And I note that a number of other Senators have done the same—both before and since my statement. One of these Senators, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is offering an amendment to the bill now under discussion to make the pay increase for Members of Congress conditional upon their making public their outside interests and income. Mr. President, I consider this to be an equitable and meritorious amendment, and I shall support it.

The legislation we are considering today will do much to provide more equitable compensation for those who would serve their country by carrying out the functions of Government. We cannot afford to have a second-best Government, and we cannot afford to have second-rate Government employees. By assuring adequate salaries, we can assure that we will have the best minds to assist us in meeting the challenge of the space age. To fail to do this in the name of economy would be a sad case of being "penny wise and pound foolish" and would be an error which would cause us great harm in coming years. We must provide an investment in quality personnel that will bring us returns in good Government for many years to come.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The pending amendment is truly a junior Morse amendment. There was much more to

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

the Morse amendment than there is to the pending amendment.

As stated earlier, a resolution on the subject has been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. That resolution will be brought before the Senate, and would have been brought up whether or not the proposal was before us at the present time. At that time there will be opportunity enough for discussion, instead of spending only a few minutes on it during the consideration of the pending bill, a bill in which it really has no place.

I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment and that the arguments that have been made will be brought up when the resolution which has been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration comes before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. KEATING. The essential difference between my amendment and the resolution which is now at the desk is that the resolution would apply only to the Members of this body. The amendment would write that provision into law for all Members of Congress. I believe conflict-of-interest rules are the kind of thing that should be treated by a statute and have the force and effect of law. They are, in my judgment, inappropriate to be treated simply by a Senate resolution. When the Senate resolution is brought up, however, it could be strengthened in such a way as to be meaningful.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who is the ranking member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the indications are that we shall not reach a final vote on the bill before I must leave in order to keep a prior commitment. I wish the RECORD to show that if present and voting, I would vote for the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, earlier today I offered an amendment to the Morse amendment. I had prepared an amendment which I had intended to offer to the Keating amendment, but in view of the rejection of my amendment to the Morse amendment by the Senate, I shall not offer the one I have prepared, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MILLER to the amendment by Mr. KEATING, No. 1092, is as follows:

On page 1, line 10, insert after the word "agency" the following: "and owned within the immediately preceding twelve months by such Member, officer, and employee, his or her spouse, children and their spouses, brothers and sisters, father and mother, and any trust or fiduciary arrangement under which any of the said individuals is a beneficiary or over which he or she exerts any control".

On page 2, strike lines 1 and all of line 2 through the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "amount and specific source of each item of compensation and income in excess of $100 received during the immediately preceding calendar year by such Member, officer, and employee, his or her spouse, children and their spouses, brothers and sisters, father and mother, and any trust or fiduciary arrangement under which any of said individuals is a beneficiary or over which he or she exerts any control."

On page 2, line 12, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That if said Member, officer, or employee is unable to file any statement pertaining to the financial interest, compensation and income of any of the individuals or entities listed in section 601 other than his or her spouse and minor children because of their refusal to provide such information, said increase in compensation shall nevertheless become effective upon the filing of a statement, under oath, by said Member, officer, or employee that his or her failure to comply with all of the requirements of section 601 is due to such refusal."

Mr. MILLER. What I had to say about the Morse amendment is equally applicable to the pending amendment. The proposal will not get the job done. It will not satisfy the public if the public wants disclosure. The disclosure of what a Member, an officer, or employee's contacts are with federally regulated agencies, or his own income, will not satisfy the problems that the Senator from Arizona pointed out. If we wish to have disclosure that will satisfy the situation, we shall have to bring in the spouse, the brothers and sisters, the father and mother, and any trust or fiduciary arrangement, not to mention the children.

The amendment fails to do that. If some Senator wishes to offer an amendment to perfect the pending amendment, I shall be happy to support it. Senators have spoken on my previous amendment, and I shall not push them on the question at the present time. In view of that, I shall have to vote against the Keating amendment.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a half minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield a half minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Iowa will not offer his amendment?

Mr. MILLER. That is correct.

Mr. DODD. I believe that is regrettable. I am sorry that the Senator did not press for a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment earlier, when the Morse disclosure amendment was being discussed. I believe his amendment goes to the heart of the problem. We are not fooling ourselves or anyone else by howling down with a voice vote the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, as was done earlier this afternoon. Everyone knows of devices in which a wife's name is used, or a child's name, a sister's name, a brother's name, or when a trust is established.

I agree with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished minority leader, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], who have spoken against these disclosure amendments. If we are going to be honest, we should include the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, too. It is regrettable that the amendment was not offered so we could have a rollcall vote on it this time. I want the Senate to know that I will offer an amendment similar to the Senator's at a later date, when we are discussing the Rules Committee resolution.

I am voting against the Keating amendment, as I did against the Morse amendment, not because I am against disclosure but because I want to wait until the Rules Committee resolution is taken up.

This is the proper way to take up an important matter on the floor of the Senate, not as an amendment to a bill concerned with an entirely different subject, considered under a one-half hour time limitation.

The distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] has given assurances that we will have an opportunity to discuss this soon and I think we should wait until then to decide the issue.

The PRESIDING OFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield back his time?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the on the amendment has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 61, as follows:

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

[No. 467 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Burdick	Javits	Pastore
Case	Keating	Proxmire
Church	Kuchel	Scott
Clark	Magnuson	Symington
Cooper	McGee	Thurmond
Douglas	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Moss	
Jackson	Nelson	

NAYS—61

Aiken	Gruening	Morton
Allott	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Anderson	Hill	Muskie
Bartlett	Holland	Neuberger
Beall	Humphrey	Pearson
Bennett	Inouye	Pell
Bible	Johnston	Prouty
Boggs	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Brewster	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Lausche	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Russell
Cannon	Long, La.	Simpson
Carlson	Mansfield	Smith
Curtis	McCarthy	Sparkman
Dirksen	McClellan	Stennis
Dodd	McIntyre	Tower
Eastland	McNamara	Walters
Edmondson	Mechem	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Miller	
Goldwater	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—14

Bayh	Fong	Saltonstall
Cotton	Hart	Smathers
Dominick	Hayden	Talmadge
Ellender	Hruska	Yarborough
Engle	Kennedy	

So Mr. KEATING's amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have an amendment, which has been agreed to by the committee. It deals with the inclusion of the Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, in level 4 of the Federal executive salary schedule.

The bill had passed through the House and had not yet reached us before we had marked up the bill. Consequently no provision was made for the salary of Deputy Inspector General position, which had been created.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 123, between lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

(57) Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance.

On pages 123 and 124, it is proposed to renumber (57) to (71) as (58) to (72), respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 113, line 20, strike "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500", and in line 23 strike "$28,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,500".

On page 114, line 3, strike "$26,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,500"; in line 6 strike "$24,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,000"; in line 8 strike "$22,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000"; in line 13 strike "$27,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000"; in line 22 strike "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500"; and in line 24 strike "$43,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$40,000".

On page 115, line 20, strike "$35,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000".

On page 116, line 8, strike "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500".

On page 117, line 15, strike "$28,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$26,000".

On page 120, line 2, strike "$27,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,500".

On page 124, line 20, strike "$26,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,500".

On page 155, line 20, strike "$25,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,000".

On page 156, line 7, strike "$26,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000"; in line 22, strike "$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,000"; and in line 24, strike "$24,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,500".

On page 157, line 6, strike "$24,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,000"; in line 8, strike "$23,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,500"; and in line 14, strike "$23,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,500".

On page 164, line 4, strike "$22,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000"; in line 14, strike "$33,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,500"; in line 17, strike "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500"; in line 18, strike "$30,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$28,000"; in line 21, strike "$33,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,500"; and in line 25, strike "$33,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,500".

On page 165, line 3, strike "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500"; in line 9, strike "$27,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000"; in line 10, strike "$26,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,500"; in line 16, strike "$26,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,000"; and in line 24, strike "$30,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500".

On page 166, line 3, strike "$33,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,500".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I shall be brief in explaining the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator raise his voice so we can hear him?

Mr. MILLER. I shall as soon as the Chamber has quieted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, what the amendment does is as follows: In section 203 on pages 113 and 114, the increases are cut back by $2,500. In section 204, on page 114, the salary of the Members of Congress are increased by $5,000 instead of $7,500. The Speaker's pay is increased by $5,000, instead of $8,000.

In section 303, on page 115, the salaries of Cabinet members are increased by $5,000, instead of $10,000.

The rest of the salaries in the executive and judiciary and the District of Columbia are cut by $2,500. In effect, that means an increase of $5,000 instead of $7,500, with the exception of the President of the District of Columbia Commissioners, who would have an extra $500.

The Allott amendment is preserved in my amendment. That is all the amendment does.

It seems to me that an opportunity ought to be given to the Senate to reflect whether it wishes to establish a pattern of a $10,000 increase for Cabinet members and a pattern of $7,500 for most of the other people involved, instead of $5,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [putting the question].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The committee amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall, of course, support the bill. It is long overdue justice to Federal employees.

THE CONTINUING FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Federal Government has actively searched since June 21 for the 3 missing men in Mississippi, yesterday stepping up to 400 the number of U.S. service personnel aiding the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the search. In my judgment, this search should be continued until some clue to their fate has been discovered, even if it takes all summer to do it.

This is the least we can do to keep faith with the Federal guarantee to every citizen of freedom to travel and exercise other constitutional rights in every State of the United States. I note with great interest a report in yesterday's New York Times to the effect that, during the search, intimidation and harassment of civil rights workers in Mississippi have been materially reduced. The report goes on to state, however, that it is expected by those in the area that, once the searchers leave, the reign of terror against the youthful civil rights workers will resume.

How can a recurrence of this event be prevented during the long hot summer of civil rights activities and racial discord, which has undoubtedly only just begun in Mississippi?

Now that the Federal Government has made the commitment, after the fact, to resolve the awful tragedy of these tnree missing men, it would be doubly tragic if the Government of the United States

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

did not protect the remaining students against further recurrences. Continuing the search is one way to help this. Another way is for the President to announce, contemporaneously with the signing into law of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that the enjoyment in Mississippi of rights of American citizens will be safeguarded with the full authority of the United States.

Citizens who travel from State to State for lawful purposes, such as these students who seek to educate Negroes to exercise their constitutional right to vote, deserve the protection of the U.S. Government. Nor should the Government insist that death or serious injury befall them before it extends its protection.

I note also that yesterday 29 professors of law in 6 universities expressed public disagreement with Attorney General Kennedy's flat assertion that the Federal Government lacked the power to take effective action in Mississippi.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement of the 29 law professors.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

It has been reported in the press that the Attorney General has stated that the Federal Government lacks power to take preventive police action in Mississippi to secure the safety of persons who have come into that State to aid its colored residents in the effective exercise of their rights as citizens of the United States. The undersigned students of public law are troubled by the misleading simplicity of this reported pronouncement, and believing that the Federal power to take protective action in the circumstances that now prevail in Mississippi is clear, are moved to make this statement.

Under section 332 of title 10 of the United States Code the President is authorized to use the State militia and the Armed Forces of the United States "whenever he considers that unlawful obstruction, combinations, or assemblages * * * make it impracticable to enforce the laws of the United States * * * by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings." Should the President be persuaded that judicial processes are not able to secure the rights of Negro voters in Mississippi or should he consider that those processes are not effectively safeguarding the rights of other Americans as they are defined in existing civil rights acts (e.g., sec. 1981 and 1983 of title 42) the quoted section would clearly authorize him to use armed forces to secure the rights referred to.

Of course the Attorney General knows this, for it was under section 332 that President Kennedy took military action at the University of Mississippi in 1962. Quite probably two considerations are factors in the Attorney General's determination that section 332 has no immediate relevance. He and the President may be convinced that the time has not yet come to send military forces into Mississippi—that other processes should be exhausted before that most drastic of all remedies is pursued. If that judgment is a crucial element in the decision one wishes that it had been reported, for it would have made it clear that it is not lack of presidential power to act but the absence of a conviction that action is now called for that explains nonaction. Furthermore, the Attorney General may, with some justification, feel that when military action is taken under section 332 it is not fairly to be described as police action—the type of action which he has denied the Federal Government is empowered to take. These considerations which may explain the Attorney General's rejection of the current relevance of section 332, seem far less applicable to the provisions of section 333 of title 10.

Under the terms of that section the scope of the Presidential power to take protective and preventive action is not confined to the use of the militia or Armed Forces. Though section 333 mentions specifically the power to use those forces it also empowers him "by any other means (to) take such action as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, if it (1) so hinders the execution of the laws of that State, and of the United States within the State, that any part or class of its people is deprived of a right, privilege, immunity, or protection named in the Constitution and secured by law, and the constituted authorities of that State are unable, fail, or refuse to protect that right, privilege, or immunity, or to give that protection; or (2) opposes or obstructs the execution of the laws of the United States or impedes the course of justice under those laws."

Surely there is reason to believe that violence and combination are now so hindering the execution of the laws of Mississippi and of the United States as to deny to the Negroes of Mississippi rights secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States. Whether the deplorable circumstances are such as to make the provisions in subsection (1) of the quoted section now operative is not important, for there can be no question but that the provisions of subsection (2) fit the present circumstances precisely. Violence, combination, and conspiracy in Mississippi are unquestionably obstructing the execution of the civil rights laws of the United States—the provisions, that is, of sections 1981 and 1983 of title 42 and the provisions of the acts of 1957 and 1960 with respect to voting rights.

Doubtless some creditable considerations of expedience could be cited to support a decision against now taking vigorous Presidential action under section 333 in Mississippi. Surely, however, the Attorney General's position would be less misleading and, therefore, less perilous if he would acknowledge that the President today has power to act but believes that police action under section 333 of title 10 is inadvisable.

In the year 1879 it was argued in the Supreme Court of the United States that when Federal marshals sought to enforce the electoral laws of the United States their conduct infringed the prerogatives of the States—that the Nation, in other words, could not, through the authority of its agents, take police action within the borders of any State. "It is argued," said Mr. Justice Bradley, "that the preservation of peace and good order in society is not within the powers confided to the Government of the United States, but belongs exclusively to the States. Here again we are met with the theory that the Government of the United States does not rest upon the soil and territory of the country. We think that this theory is founded upon an entire misconception of the nature and powers of that Government. We hold it to be an incontrovertible principle, that the Government of the United States may, by means of physical force, exercised through its official agents, execute on every foot of American soil the powers and functions that belong to it. This necessarily involves the power to command obedience to its laws, and hence the power to keep the peace to that extent." (Ex parte Siebold, 100 U.S. 371, 394–395.)

Unless the Attorney General disregards or somehow emasculates this pronouncement of the Supreme Court he cannot rest his case for Executive inaction on the facile pronouncement that the Federal Government and the President of the United States are not empowered to take police action in Mississippi. It is at once disappointing and ironic that the Department of Justice, which has been bold beyond precedent in successfully urging the Supreme Court that the judiciary possesses the broadest powers to enforce the constitutional assurances of equality, should now discover non-existent barriors to executive action.

SIGNERS OF STATEMENT

Columbia University Law School: Marvin E. Frankel, Arthur W. Murphy, Maurice Rosenberg, Michael I. Sovern.

Harvard Law School: Paul Bator, Vern Countryman, Charles Fried, Mark DeW. Howe, Louis Loss, John Mansfield, Henry Steiner, Arthur E. Sutherland.

New York University Law School: Charles E. Ares, Norman Dorsen, Henry Foster, Jr., Robert B. McKay, Gerhard O. W. Mueller.

University of Pennsylvania Law School: Caleb Foote, Jefferson B. Fordham (reservations as to phrasing), Alexander H. Frey, Noyes Leech, Clarence Morris, Louis B. Schwartz (reservations as to phrasing), Bernard Wolfman.

Yale Law School: Boris I. Bittker, Charles L. Black, Jr., Thomas I. Emerson, Louis H. Pollak.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the course of the debate on the bill, many amendments were offered. I voted either for or against them—that is most of them, because I anticipated that the measure would be enacted into law. I recognize that the issues we are dealing with and the principles that are involved in the proposed legislation address themselves primarily to the discretion, the good judgment, and the conscience of each individual Member of Congress.

I have weighed carefully all of the considerations involved, and I have concluded that I cannot vote for the enactment of the bill. I feel it my duty, therefore, to state for the RECORD my reasons for opposing it. I state them primarily for the RECORD, without any thought that I can influence the vote of any other Member. I do not seek to do so, because I expect each Member to vote his own judgment and his own conviction.

Mr. President, I must reluctantly vote against the bill. First, because it covers some employees whose salaries should be increased—postal employees and others. I vote against it reluctantly because by doing so I vote against my own financial interest, against my own profit, and against a gain to myself, to the extent of $7,500 a year increase in my salary, and after taxes, possibly to the extent of about $350 a month additional income.

Also, Mr. President, I am voting against my own interest because if the bill were enacted it would probably enhance my retirement pay by about $150 to $200 a month. The proposal is attractive and it is appealing, and is just as tempting to me, I am sure, as it is to any other

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Member of the Senate. Therefore I should like to support it. In voting against it, I wish the RECORD to show that I am hurting myself financially more, denying myself more, inflicting a greater financial loss on myself than I am denying to any constitutent of mine who is covered by the bill.

I cannot vote for it because we have a national debt, or will soon have one, of about $324 billion—the new debt limit. The Federal debt is rapidly increasing. I must ask myself, if I vote for it, where are we going to get the money with which to pay the additional $500 million annual cost of Government that it will incur.

We cannot get it from the Federal Treasury. It is not there to get.

We do not have the money. We must borrow it. That is the only way we can get the money. We must borrow it at interest. We cannot borrow it free of interest.

Therefore, we are increasing the deficit that will occur hereafter each year by about $500 million when we vote for the bill. The deficit in the past 4 years has aggregated about $26.4 billion, or about $6.5 billion annually.

Is a balanced budget in sight? The answer is "No." I believe there is a slight suggestion, or a vague suggestion, from the Secretary of the Treasury that we may be able to balance the budget in 1967. But I take that prophecy with a large grain of salt. I heard the minority leader today quote a distinguished authority on his side of the aisle who indicated that it will not be balanced until 1972.

I do not believe it will be balanced again at any time in the foreseeable future. There is nothing to indicate that it will be.

We are not now on the right track to balance it on either of those dates, or at any future date because we are continuously increasing the cost of Government.

Last year we reduced taxes by $11 billion. Last week the Senate voted further to reduce taxes by about $600 million. The House did not go along with that reduction. Therefore we will not immediately sustain that loss.

However, we are increasing the cost of Government continuously.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point tables which show that this Congress, the 88th Congress, has already enacted legislation, which will increase the cost of Government by $7,216 million the first year following its enactment. Over the first 5-year period following its enactment the cost will be $26,706 million annually.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATED COST OF MAJOR LAWS ENACTED DURING THE 88TH CONG. AND ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDED BY THE ADMINISTRATION AWAITING ACTION

Summary statement of total estimated cost of major laws passed and of others sponsored by the administration that are still awaiting action

	1st-year cost	5-year cost
Public laws:		
Nondefense programs already public law will cost	$2,547,000,000	$3,592,000,000
Additional defense spending now public law will cost	3,243,000,000	16,215,000,000
Space technology increase over fiscal 1963 for fiscal 1964	1,426,000,000	7,230,000,000
Subtotal of spending already public law	7,216,000,000	27,037,000,000
Awaiting Senate or House action:		
Administration nondefense proposals awaiting action will cost	7,186,000,000	24,346,000,000
Space technology increase for fiscal 1965 over fiscal 1964	590,000,000	2,360,000,000
Defense increases largely offset by decreases		
Subtotal of nondefense and defense and spending programs awaiting action	7,776,000,000	26,706,000,000
Grand total of both defense and nondefense spending proposals, both public law and awaiting action	14,992,000,000	53,743,000,000

NOTE.—These estimates are reasonably accurate, although they are not, of course, exact.

Nondefense spending increases

COST OF MAJOR BI LLS PASSED AND WIIICH ARE NOW PUBLIC LAWS

Public law number and objective	1st-year cost	5-year cost
1. Public Law 88-25, area redevelopment program, added funds	$450,000,000	$450,000,000
2. Public Law 88-101, increase in resources of Export-Import Bank	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000
3. Public Law 88-129, health program, medical facilities and personnel	34,000,000	750,000,000
4. Public Law 88-136, immunization program for children	13,000,000	63,000,000
5. Public Law 88-156, mental health and retardation and maternal health	50,000,000	[1] 329,000,000
Total nondefense spending programs now public law	2,547,000,000	3,592,000,000

COST OF PROPOSALS SUPPORTED BY THE ADMINISTRATION THAT ARE STILL BEFORE CONGRESS

Bill description and number	1st-year cost	5-year cost	Present status of proposal
1. Food for Peace, increase in program (S. 2687)	$500,000,000	$500,000,000	
2. Urban mass transit (S. 6)	100,000,000	375,000,000	Passed Senate Apr. 4, 1963. Passed House June 25, 1964.
3. Federal employees' salary adjustment (H.R. 11049)	533,000,000	2,660,000,000	Passed House June 11, 1964.
4. Area redevelopment (S. 1163)	455,000,000	455,000,000	Passed Senate June 26, 1963 (House Rules Committee).
5. Housing and urban renewal [2] (H.R. 9751, S. 2468)	1,631,000,000	1,631,000,000	In hearings.
6. Fallout shelter (H.R. 8200; S. 844)	300,000,000	300,000,000	Passed House Sept. 17, 1963.
7. Food stamp extension of pilot program (H.R. 10222)	25,000,000	400,000,000	Conference June 30, 1964.
8. Aid for Appalachia (H.R. 11065; S. 2782)	252,000,000	3,000,000,000	In hearings.
9. Conservation funds (H.R. 3846; S. 859)	60,000,000	300,000,000	H. Rept. 900, Nov. 14, 1963.
10. Medical care for aged under social security (H.R. 3920; S. 880)	1,100,000,000	5,500,000,000	Hearings in House.
11. Poverty program (H.R. 11377; S. 2642)	962,500,000	[3] 2,887,500,000	H. Rept., June 3, 1964.
12. Education omnibus program—Federal aid (H.R. 3000; S. 580)	1,215,000,000	6,075,000,000	
13. Extension and increase in Hill-Burton (H.R. 10041)	52,500,000	262,500,000	Passed House May 25, 1964.
Total nondefense spending pending	7,186,000,000	24,346,000,000	

[1] 4-year program.
[2] Supposedly a 1-shot program.
[3] 3-year program.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. McCLELLAN. Now I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas referred to measures that would further unbalance the budget. I noticed he did not refer to the fact that the Budget also suggests pay increases for the members of the armed services amounting to between $250 million and $300 million a year.

The armed services do not have unions. They do not have legislative representatives in Washington. They are unable to lobby among Members of Congress. Therefore, they always await action on the increases in pay for civilian employees.

I must also say that the members of the Armed Forces do not work a 40-hour week. Some of them are being killed in Vietnam now—and I am confident that some of them do not know exactly why. But they render great services in protecting this country.

When the bill is passed—as I am confident it will be—I shall regard it as my duty to hold hearings to at least equalize the position of the members of the armed services with that of civilian employees, who have a safe assignment at home, a 40-hour week, and substantial increases in pay, but are not required to places their lives in jeopardy by defending their country.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Georgia. The bill does invite further increases in the cost of government. Not only that; it invites a break in the hold-the-line policy in industry with respect to wages and profits. Negotiations are now underway in one of our vital industries—the automobile industry—for a large increase in wages. That will also mean an increase in prices of new automobiles. They propose to go beyond the yardstick that the President has suggested is necessary to hold the line in order to prevent inflation.

If we pass this bill and add another $500 million to the cost of government by raising our salaries by 33⅓ percent, and grant the other salary raises it provides, then where is that yardstick which the President established at about 3 percent as being all that could be justified? We shall be inviting everyone to say that he shall have to have higher wages and salaries—more money. The primary responsibility rests upon Congress to set an example and not break the barrier, a barrier which, if broken, can lead to great inflationary pressures—and thus to a dangerous inflationary spiral.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator from Arkansas believe that it would be fair to grant these increases but deny an even more modest increase to the members of the armed services?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; if we grant this increase, I think the wage earner is entitled to come in through bargaining channels and say, "We are entitled to more. What will the barrier mean if we break it? What does the guideline mean if Congress itself is not going to respect it. If the administration itself is not going to observe it, why should we single out labor and business, and try to say that they should not have similar increases?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is difficult for one to face objectively the issue of a pay increase for the many employees of the Government in an election year. It seems that this question is before us in almost every election year.

Difficult as it is, I shall vote against the bill for several reasons. First, the bill contains many unjustified benefits, including an increase in excess of $600 a month in the compensation of already inactive Federal judges, an increase in the salary of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate from $21,500 to $27,500, an increase in the salary of Senate pages to approximately $5,000, and a substantial increase in the pay of rural carriers, whose short hours already make that position among the most sought after in the country.

Moreover, as the Senator has said, with the tax cut, it will be necessary to borrow every dollar to pay this more than $500 million increase in the Federal budget.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. There are two other points I wish to make. In the first place, the argument has been made that this Government is the biggest corporation or business in the world and that we, the Members of Congress, are its directors. That we ought to have compensation that is somewhat comparable to that of the directors of large corporations in private enterprise. I am not arguing against that. I have received—as I am sure other Senators have—many letters saying that Senators and Representatives are not worth that much. I do not agree with that at all. That is not the reason why I oppose the bill. Any Member of Congress who is competent and capable of meeting the responsibilities and fulfilling the duties of a United States Senator, and who is worthy of serving in either body of Congress, is worth $30,000 a year, and possibly more, as compared with the level of our economy and what is paid in business and industry. That is not the reason for my opposition to this bill. But if we want to think in terms of private corporations, let me ask this question: What board of directors of a private corporation would vote themselves a 33⅓-percent ($7,500) increase in salary with a record of deficits year after year after year, such as has occurred in the operation of the Federal Government under the direction of the Congress? Such a board of a corporation would not last at all. The corporation would soon go bankrupt, and the directors would be fired by the stockholders. So a sound argument for this bill cannot be put on that premise. It cannot be made to stand.

I wish to make one final observation. Sacrifice, if there is to be any, should begin with us. If we sincerely desire to pursue sound fiscal policies and balance the budget; if we mean to best serve our country; we should be willing to make some sacrifice. We are doing it on our present salary; I do not think there is any question about that. I think sacrifice is involved here. But I think the times call for it. They demand sacrifice on our part. We in this body should set the example. We ride herd on administrative agencies to economize so that we might not go into debt so much, so fast, and so deep. So, we should exercise due restraint ourselves.

If we pass the bill, we will not be asking, "What can I do for my country?" We will be asking, "What can my country do for me?" We shall be writing a ticket that will be reversing what the great President Kennedy said in his inaugural address. We shall be rephrasing and in practice reversing his famous remark—admonition.

I cannot go along with the bill. That is the way I feel about it. I do not believe that I am morally justified in voting a pay increase for myself under these circumstances and charging that increase into the national debt for some future generation to pay. No, I do not think they will pay it if we do pass the bill; but it will be an added burden on the next generation. I do not believe that we of this generation should charge that character of expense to the next generation.

I therefore cannot vote for the bill. I shall be compelled to vote against it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Caution Light," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 1, 1964.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAUTION LIGHT

This is D-day for the beginning of a test which will make or break President Johnson's effort to hold the line against inflation.

With the opening of contract talks between the United Automobile Workers and the big three in the automobile industry, the issue is clearly drawn.

Mr. Johnson is committed to a guideline which would hold wage increases within the limits of higher productivity—generally 3.2 percent. But George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, is openly defiant. If we think a higher wage rise is justified, he has said, we "will not be stymied by guidelines." Walter Reuther, UAW head, is calling for a 4.9 increase for his union members, along with other substantial boosts in benefits. And the AFL–CIO executive council has formally proclaimed that "neither wage nor price restraints are tolerable in a free society except in the gravest national emergency and then only when coupled with restraints upon excess profits."

What will emerge from all this remains to be seen. But it could be of crucial importance.

President Johnson says he has set up an early warning system and that he will draw public attention to any excesses by unions or management. To us, this sounds as though he is thinking in terms of a slap on the wrist. Henry Ford II is taking a tougher line. He told a business audience last month that willingness on the part of the public, Government, and management to accept a strike if necessary, is part of the price we must pay for the preservation of free and responsible collective bargaining—whether that willingness is ever put to the test or not.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Well, we'll see. The industry has been prospering, and it may take a strike rather than see the guideline broken. But it is doubtful that either the union or the industry is really thinking seriously in strike terms.

The big threat is an excessive wage increase followed by a price increase. Doubtless big labor and big business would survive. But the little fellows, especially those living on more or less fixed incomes, will face ruin if the monster of inflation is turned loose again in this country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have only one more request for time. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon; then I shall yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have decided to vote for the bill. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that I shall support a substantial increase in pay for the members of the armed services, at least those in the lower and medium pay brackets. In no case will I support a percentage figure for members of the armed services less than the lowest percentage increase provided in this bill.

So long as we cannot do away with the excise taxes, we need to stimulate the economy for the purchases of civilian goods. We should repeal the excise tax and I shall do all that I can to achieve that objective.

Also, before Congress adjourns, I shall offer legislation by way of a rider on the floor of the Senate that will increase social security payments by at least 10 percent more than the largest percentage increase in pay provided in this bill, and probably more.

But so long as Congress can continue to waste money on the foreign aid bill, at least half of the money that the Foreign Relations Committee authorized this afternoon, and throw that money down the ratholes around the world, not only without justification but also to the long-time detriment of the United States, I am not going to be too concerned about passing a pay bill that will enter into the economic stream of American life.

I am a strong believer in taking care of our problems at home before we waste our money abroad. Because we have been following this unsound course of action in regard to not decreasing excise taxes, not increasing social security benefits, and not giving a fair deal to those members in our armed services, I have decided to vote for the bill in the hope that in the long run the increase in pay may result in making the Government service more enlightened within those who have been following the mistaken policy which now characterizes the legislative process.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am opposed to H.R. 11049, the Pay Raise Act of 1964, in the form in which it is now before the Senate. My newsletter of June 22, 1964, to my constituents outlines my reasons for opposing the bill. I ask unanimous consent that this newsletter, entitled "On Increasing Pay," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON INCREASING PAY

(By Senator STROM THURMOND)

The Senate will be soon called on to vote on a pay increase for all Federal Government employees. The bill would cost an additional $534 million per year. It covers all Government employees, including members of the Supreme Court, the Congress, and executive branch officials up to and including the Vice President. For most Government employees, this would be the third pay increase in 21 months, the first having gone into effect in October 1962, the second in January 1964, and this one would be effective on being signed into law, except for Members of Congress who would wait until January.

In the past I have voted for most Government pay increases. I want to see Federal workers adequately paid. In fact, I would be willing to support a cost-of-living increase this year. However, this legislation goes far beyond providing a cost-of-living increase for the higher level jobs. Members of Congress would, for instance, receive an increase of 33⅓ percent or even more if the Senate pushes the congressional boost from $22,500 to $32,500.

It is my conviction that individuals offering for elective office should not be looking for financial gain. Public office is a public trust, and the chief aim of those in public office should be service to the public.

One of the reasons the congressional increase is being pushed is so that high-level employees can be raised. Many of them are now almost on a pay par with the Congress. There is a general understanding that they will not be paid as much or more than the Members of Congress, thus the invitation for the Congress to raise its own pay.

The spread in pay increases for Government employees would range from 3 to 33⅓ percent. The lower percentage figures would be made applicable to the lower pay grades where the increases are most needed. Many top-level administrative jobs would be boosted by as much as $4,500 per year. This is more than many people in America make each year. This hike for the upper levels is sought to be justified on the plea that good employees are leaving Government because they cannot live off $20,000 per year. One of those who recently left Government for greener pastures was Walter Heller, former Chairman of the President's Board of Economic Advisers. He is the man who tried to sell the country on the false economic theory that deficit spending is not only necessary for our country, but is actually better for us in time of war and peace.

Recently President Johnson announced that "He (Heller) has gone $16,000 into debt because of Government service and has been forced to leave." Heller could not survive in Washington for a few years off $20,500 per year and the very type of deficit spending which he charted for our Government. Instead of being an argument for this bill, the Heller story constitutes one of the most essential reasons for voting against the bill, especially if more of these impractical apostles of big spending follow his example and get out. Several have already done so.

One of the principal reasons this bill in its present form should be defeated is simply because the U.S. Treasury cannot afford to add another $500 million annually to our deficits. The Congress is being asked now to raise the debt limit to $324 billion, and the deficit for this fiscal year is estimated to be $6.8 billion.

Both psychologically and as a practical matter, this gigantic pay boost would set the stage for an inflationary spiral through increased wage and price demands in industry at a time when the President has called for restraint and responsibility in wage and price demands.

Even if the President is unwilling to heed his own advice, the Congress should be willing to set the example of restraint and responsibility for the Nation, especially with regard to its own proposed pay increase of $7,500 or $10,000 per year.

No company of stockholders would permit its board of directors to spend billions more than the company's income in 29 of the last 35 years and then vote itself a pay raise of 33⅓ percent or more to add to the company's growing indebtedness. The stockholders of our government, the taxpaying public, should take this same attitude. The public should demand that big spending in government be stopped and that the Congress set the example for "restraint and responsibility" in spending and all spheres of government activities.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the defeat of the Proxmire motion to eliminate congressional salaries from the pay increase bill places me, as it does many others, in a cruel dilemma as regards the proper vote which I should cast on the question of passage of the bill.

I believe in increasing the pay in the postal service, the pay for the judiciary, and the pay for those in the classified civil service. I accept an increase in the pay of the top administrators as probably necessary in the society in which we live; although I hope the joy and honor of public service, rather than material emoluments, may be the main motivation for them, as indeed it should be for all others.

I recognize that the public administrators do not have the opportunity for legitimate outside earnings which we in Congress possess. I also know that they and their families predominantly live and move in the social circles of the so-called "managerial elite," where the prestige of the family depends in large part upon the salary which the head of the household receives. These are the realities; and, as a realist, I accept them. An increase in the salaries of these men and women is probably necessary if we are to retain them in public service, although I hope—somewhat wistfully—that money will not be the main incentive for their work.

I am, therefore, in favor of all parts of the present bill except that which provides for an increase in congressional salaries. Some of us have failed in our efforts to eliminate this feature; and we are now confronted with the question of how we should vote on the bill as it now stands. I believe that three lines of action are open to me and to others in the same position.

First. We can vote for the bill, in order to show our support for the salary increases for the million and three-quarter others, and can swallow our scruples at voting for an increase for ourselves.

Second. We can vote against the bill, in order to emphasize our opposition to the congressional pay increase. But this would help to deprive the army of Federal workers of salary increases which are justly theirs.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Third. We can ask to be excused from voting, because of a conflict of interest. In ordinary situations, where such conflicts of interest are confined to a few Members, this might well be the proper thing to do. But in connection with a matter such as this, in which the interests of all Members are involved, such a course could not be universalized, since then the entire Congress would be immobilized. The granting of such immunity from voting by the Senate could therefore only be an act of indulgence to the specific individuals, and could not be universalized.

None of these alternatives is perfect. Each and every one has vital flaws. I have no certainty that my own final decision is correct; but I have reluctantly decided to vote for the bill, in order not to deprive a million and three-quarters others of the salary increases which I believe are necessary and desirable. If I am criticized, on the ground that this does bring with it an increase in my own pay, I can only say that I supported and voted for the amendment to strip from the act any special benefits for myself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in 1962 the U.S. Congress passed the Federal Salary Reform Act, and went on record in favor of comparability between pay for Government employees and pay for private-enterprise employees at the same levels. Once taken, even such a fundamental change has a way of looking inevitable. It now seems to us only proper that the Government should be prepared to compete for able employees, and that these employees should not be stigmatized with consistently lower salaries than those of their counterparts in private industry.

The policy was accepted by Congress for valid and compelling reasons. The bill we are now considering is the first effort to apply in a thorough and comprehensive fashion the announced policy. Its details have been hammered out during months of work by the respective Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the House and Senate and during debate on the floor of the House. The Senate committee has made several significant improvements over the House version of the bill, including an increase in the salary of middle-management career employees.

The bill does not merely reflect the sentiment in favor of salary increases, although this sentiment is apparent and strong. The pay increases for career employees have been taken out of the realm of whim and pressure politics, and have been placed on a sound statistical basis. Our duty is to verify the facts and figures presented and to determine whether the bill under consideration does indeed apply fairly the comparability principle, and whether we can afford to make good our commitment.

I believe we cannot afford to ignore it. We must offer Federal employees a guarantee of financial security and an incentive to remain with the Government and to increase their skills. The career employees of the Federal Government are a great force for stability and continuity. They watch elected and appointed officials come and go, and they faithfully serve each new administration. They are the capacious hold of the ship of government, and their expertise and experience are the machinery which keep that ship afloat, in whatever direction the helm is turned.

The news in this bill is its reappraisal of executive, judicial, and legislative salaries. These provisions are largely based on study and recommendations by the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems. This panel was charged with the task of bringing order out of a chaotic salary structure, fraught with contradictions and inadequate to the task of attracting and keeping the high-quality executives our Nation needs and deserves. The Randall report has carried out its mandate to recommend appropriate levels of salaries, and to establish proper relationships between the salaries of executives, career employees, Members of Congress, and the judiciary. The panel did an outstanding job; and its recommendations, in modified form, are reflected in the present bill.

This bill is controversial. But at the moment we are not engaged in a popularity contest. We are seeking a reasonable and effective solution of a problem that long has plagued the Government.

Mr. President, the 88th Congress has been neither timid nor indolent in facing its tasks and responsibilities. We have frankly settled a legislative issue that has bedeviled Congress for decades, by passing a Civil Rights Act based firmly on the principle of equal rights under the Constitution for every American citizen.

The bill now before us is not so sweeping in its scope or so morally imperative; but it has deep significance for the future, and deep practical importance for the present. It embraces the question of whether we shall demand and reward excellence in the men and women who hold high positions of trust in our Government. It confronts the problem of keeping these posts open to talent from all income strata, and not making them, by default, the private preserve of the wealthy.

Of course, those of us charged with upholding the dignity and the quality of these top positions are the temporary beneficiaries of our own action. This responsibility cannot be made impersonal. We are men and women much like our successors, and most of us welcome a boost in salary which will allow us to meet from our salaries the unusual expenses of our office.

I do not think Congress has shown undue liberality in its own behalf. It has been almost a decade since we have considered a raise in our salaries. In that decade, we have involuntarily acquired the expensive habit of commuting. There was a time when political pulses could be felt and political fences mended during a long and leisurely summer and fall at home; but those days are irrevocably departed, and the precedent of a long session is well established.

Times have changed dramatically; and it is appropriate that we modernize a pay structure which not only has kept congressional salaries unrealistically low, but also has depressed the entire pay scale of Government officers, which traditionally is governed by congressional pay.

The bill before us recognizes the enormous recent expansion in recent decades of the responsibility in top levels of Government. No other comparable period has witnessed such a multiplication of the demands upon Federal officers. Not only have these years brought a vast increase in population, and sweeping changes in our domestic economy and social structure; they have also confirmed our inescapable obligation to active participation in international and interspatial affairs. Our top Government officers are not only leaders of the richest and most powerful Nation on earth; they also exercise unparalleled influence in world affairs. No valid comparisons can be drawn between the responsibilities of these men and those who hold positions in private industry; and this bill rightly makes no attempt to establish strict comparability.

Public service has traditionally, and proudly, been associated with certain material sacrifices. But the compensation must be sufficient to encourage men and women of ability and dedication to seek Federal service, knowing they can meet the financial obligations of their office and their responsibilities to their families. If this standard is met, we may confidently expect that the honor, the challenge, and the opportunity for Government service will continue to provide the intangibles that outweigh the inevitable disparity which will persist between governmental salaries and industrial salaries.

Finally, the point should be made, and reiterated, that a rational and realistic pay structure is not nearly so costly as incompetence, apathy, and chronic turnover. Competence and high morale are essential ingredients for true economy.

As our President—an indisputably frugal man—well understands, good Government depends on good people. The U.S. Government is not a machine which operates only on abstract principles. It is an organization of men and women. The availability and willingness to serve of outstanding and conscientious men and women determine to a large degree the effectiveness and accomplishments of our Government. We have a President who knows how to use a first-class organization; let us make sure that is what he has.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I shall vote against the pay increase bill. I would have supported the salary increases for the classified civil service employees, many of whom in the lower income brackets are finding it difficult to support their families and educate their children in a manner befitting our Federal employees. Plentiful statistics on the Federal employment situation reflect a serious problem of turnover in jobs, and show that numerous employees leave the service, for higher paying jobs in private industry. This turnover problem is costly to the taxpayers, and is even more costly than will be the cost of additional compensation in order to put these employees on a basis comparable with private industry.

But unfortunately the leadership of the House and Senate decided, over the opposition of the Government employees'

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

representatives, to tack on very large salary increases for hundreds of presidential appointees, members of the judiciary, and Members of Congress—apparently with the idea that such increases could not stand on their own merits in a separate bill. If, indeed, they are justifiable, why were they not placed in a separate bill? But they were not.

It would not have been so bad if these increases for others in the high-income brackets had not been so great. I believe that a $10,000 a year increase for the members of the Cabinet is excessive. I believe that a $7,500 a year increase for Members of Congress is somewhat excessive, particularly in the face of rejection by a majority of the Members of the Senate of the amendment, offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which would have prevented the Executive appointee and legislative increases from going into effect until after completion of a year in which we had a balanced budget. The adoption of such an amendment would have had a salutary influence on members of the executive branch and Members of Congress toward keeping faith with the purchasing power of the peoples' hard-earned money, which is steadily being eroded by the inflation which multibillion dollar deficit spending is causing.

I believe that a majority of the taxpayers would have supported a modest increase in salary for these presidential appointees, judges, and Members of Congress. Such an increase runs to the office—not to the individuals who occupy the office today, and may be gone tomorrow. My amendment to provide for increases of $5,000 for these various positions was rejected by a majority of my colleagues. Such being the case, they must bear the responsibility for the passage of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the bill has now been yielded back. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. WALTERS (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CHURCH (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. PEARSON (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay".

The respective pairs of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and that of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] have been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 21, as follows:

[No. 468 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Aiken	Burdick	Edmondson
Allott	Byrd, W. Va.	Ervin
Anderson	Cannon	Goldwater
Bartlett	Case	Gruening
Beall	Clark	Hartke
Bible	Dirksen	Hayden
Boggs	Dodd	Hill
Brewster	Douglas	Humphrey
Inouye	McIntyre	Prouty
Jackson	McNamara	Proxmire
Javits	Metcalf	Randolph
Johnston	Monroney	Ribicoff
Jordan, N.C.	Morse	Scott
Keating	Morton	Smith
Kuchel	Moss	Sparkman
Long, Mo.	Muskie	Symington
Long, La.	Nelson	Williams, N.J.
Magnuson	Neuberger	Young, N. Dak.
McCarthy	Pastore	
McGee	Pell	

NAYS—21

Bennett	Holland	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Lausche	Russell
Cooper	McClellan	Simpson
Curtis	McGovern	Stennis
Eastland	Mechem	Thurmond
Gore	Miller	Tower
Hickenlooper	Mundt	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—21

Bayh	Fong	Pearson
Carlson	Fulbright	Saltonstall
Church	Hart	Smathers
Cotton	Hruska	Talmadge
Dominick	Jordan, Idaho	Walters
Ellender	Kennedy	Williams, Del.
Engle	Mansfield	Yarborough

So the bill (H.R. 11049) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment to H.R. 11049, and ask for a conference with the House, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. CARLSON.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not have to run for election, if ever, until the year 1968. I have had no inhibition with respect to the votes which I have cast. They have been motivated solely for the purpose of serving the people of the country.

In my opinion, what has happened on the floor of the Senate today and yesterday is inimical to the security of the country.

Under the bill which has been passed, I shall be entitled to a raise in my salary of $7,500. If other Senators are entitled to it, I believe that I am.

I am conscientiously of the opinion that I have tried to preserve the security of my country. I have subordinated my interest in every instance where I thought that subordination was necessary.

I now announce that although others have done far more harm to my country than I have—and on that basis I am far more entitled to the $7,500 pay increase—I will not accept it. I will inform the paying officer that, in my judgment, what has been done is erroneous. It is not in the interest of the country. It is a theft upon savings of annuitants and pensioners. And therefore, I will not take this increased payment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 179, 88th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. FALLON, of Maryland, and Mr. CRAMER, of Florida, as members on the part of the House of the special committee to convey to the members of the American Association of State Highway Officials an expression of appreciation by the Congress of the praiseworthy accomplishments under their leadership.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6455) to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income).

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8590) to incorporate the Aviation Hall of Fame.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 321) establishing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, July 2, 1964, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, July 20, 1964.

REQUEST OF PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO RETURN TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ENROLLED BILL (H.R. 10053) TO AMEND SECTION 502 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 323), as follows:

The President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies. If and when said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing the bill shall be deemed rescinded; and the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of said bill, to make the following correction:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the proviso in the second sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1152(b)), is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1964' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1965.'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 30, 1964, pp. 14997–14998, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a colloquy on the conference report on S. 2.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLOQUY ON S. 2 CONFERENCE REPORT

Question. I have a question or two about the changes in S. 2 as agreed upon in conference. In section 100(b) it is provided that a Water Resources Research Institute may arrange for research by a component or components of the college or university with which it is affiliated.

This language indicates that the institute is intended to be collegewide or universitywide and not attached to a single component, or school, like the engineering school or the agricultural section, of the college or university.

Answer. That is correct. Water involves nearly all disciplines in the field of knowledge and all should be available to a water resources research center. The original Senate bill said the institutes should be collegewide or universitywide. In conference we agreed the words were not necessary since the institute is clearly to be a part of the whole college or university, not a part of a single department within it.

Question. The second part of my question involving this same subsection. The bill encourages the colleges and universities in two or more States to unite in a single center. Elsewhere it encourages the college or university selected for the center or institute to seek cooperation of other educational institutions in the State. Where two or more schools are working together in a single institute, would it not be proper to allow for research jobs, to be done in a component or components of more than one of the colleges or universities—components of any of the colleges or universities with which the institute is affiliated? The bill uses the singular "college or university" instead of the plural.

Answer. That is correct, and we also discussed that a little in conference. We decided use of the plural is not necessary. In title I of volume 1, section 1 of the United States Code the first sentence, which is instruction on how to read and interpret law, it says: "In determining the meaning of any act of Congress, unless the context indicates otherwise—words importing the singular include and apply to several persons, parties or things." I am sure the singular "college or university" in question can properly be read to mean the plural, as well, under this rule.

Question. The House has deleted, and you have accepted the deletion, of language which would have permitted the use of section 100(a) funds for construction and equipment of structures. Does this mean that none of the research funds would be available to construct a model of a floodgate, or that building a wavemaker to study bank erosion would not be permissible, or that you couldn't buy thermometers to take the temperature of water, or vessels to contain the water, out of such funds?

Answer. It was not intended to prevent doing the necessary construction of models or things necessary to a specific research project. The deletion was aimed at using the $75,000 to $100,000 annual grant to pay installments on a permanent campus building—structures like that. The agricultural experiment program permits supplies, instruments and things necessary to a specific research project to come out of the matching funds—but not permanent buildings or structures that ought to be financed from the university building fund. I do not believe that, following the precedent of the long established agricultural research program under the Hatch Act of 1877—now over 75 years old, there will be any difficulty with the language.

The House committee and the Senate committee want this Federal aid money to buy research—not buildings. All the legitimate expenses of research projects can be met with the matched State and Federal funds. We did unsuccessfully attempt to permit provision for employee retirement contributions out of section 100(a) grants. The House felt that since the employees would be employees of the college or university, it should handle provision for their retirement. While I prefer the authorization in the Senate bill, which parallels agricultural research arrangements, I do not believe this will impede the program. It it does, we can reconsider the matter later.

Question. Section 101(a) of S. 2 provides for matching grants in support of research projects, and it uses the phrase "to match, on a dollar-for-dollar basis". Is this language intended to exclude from the universities' matching, a fair value of the services, facilities, or other contributions a university may make toward carrying on the research?

Answer. Not at all. When a university contributes such costs they are recognized as part of its matching in agricultural research and will be in this program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a portion

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

part of that budget went toward paying people not to farm, I am not so sure that we can prove we've made progress in the past 100 years. If so, it is the kind of progress that a commonsense President like Abraham Lincoln might have difficulty understanding.

Our Agriculture Department bureaucracy, like a number of other Government agencies, is massive and powerful in the Washington scheme of things. We have the greatest agricultural plant in the world—one that Nikita Khrushchev, with his controlled farm economy, can only envy. Yet the master planners in Washington are intent on a total bureaucratic takeover of the American farmer—and a total usurpation of congressional powers in the area of farm policy.

So it is that the Kennedy administration in recent years proposed an omnibus farm program that would have clamped rigid and absolute controls on our American farmers—making them subject to jail sentence and fine if they did not conform to the bureaucratic master plan. The same legislation went so far as to try completely to eliminate congressional powers over farm policy. Under these Kennedy administrations proposals—fortunately defeated by a firm congressional stand—the Secretary of Agriculture would have written farm legislation and Congress would have had only the power to veto those laws. In other words, there would have been a complete reversal in the constitutional roles set out for the executive and legislative branches.

As I say, Congress stood firm against these farfetched plans—but regrettably, the bureaucrats have won more than their share of Washington battles in the area of domestic policy, as well as fiscal and foreign policy.

So much for my report on the danger to the checks and balances under the Constitution.

Let me in closing remind you that ours was to be a limited government, limited by the guarantees of freedom contained in the Bill of Rights—limited by its very structure as a system of checks and balances.

The Constitution, happily, endures. We still enjoy much of the freedoms guaranteed in the Bill of Rights—freedom of speech and of assembly; freedom of the press; freedom of religion; due process of law, the right to keep and bear arms, the right against unreasonable search and seizure, the right of trial by jury, etc.

I suggest that these rights will survive—and they will only if enough Americans understand, if enough Americans are taught to understand, the importance of the delicate balances and marvelous system written into our Constitution.

A free society, a free people, free enterprise—where there is protection against undue power and big government—freedom in the marketplace, such as under quality stabilization, must be maintained.

The greatness of this country depends on initiative, integrity, and decision of the individual, with an opportunity to compete and a chance to make a profit.

That kind of opportunity today has some champions.

I am proud to count myself as one of them.

With public support we will succeed.

Modernization of Federal Salary Systems

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 11, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer is very simple. It makes the effective date of this bill January 1, 1965.

Apparently, the bill as it now is written provides for salary increases for Congressmen beginning in January for political reasons. It gives everybody else a pay raise now. That does not seem to make much sense. A pay raise, if justifiable for some, should be equally justifiable for everyone at the same time. I think my amendment makes the bill a little more palatable because it puts everyone on an equal footing.

More importantly, Mr. Chairman, my amendment would help our country during a difficult financial period. We have an unbalanced budget. We are going to be asked to raise the national debt limit within a few days. We are going to be asked to maintain the present high and unpopular excise taxes. All of these things appear to me to put a pay raise now in a difficult light. I am proposing that we simply put off adding one-half billion dollars a year to the cost of government for a few months and by doing so, join hands to help our country improve its financial status. We cannot disregard our responsibility in these matters.

Under the amendment the effective date for a pay raise for all Government employees would be next January.

Dr. Roy's Able Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 21, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by the distinguished superintendent of the Millis public schools, Millis, Mass., in my district, Dr. George C. Roy, distinguished educator, outlining, and admirably analyzing H.R. 10933, introduced by me in the House.

This bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and authorize and facilitate the deduction by teachers from gross income of the expenses of education—which would include certain travel—undertaken by them, and provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deductions.

I am greatly impressed with Dr. Roy's excellent summary of this important legislation. It is exceedingly well done and, in my opinion, makes a strong argument for the bill.

I express the hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will consider this bill at an early date, because I think it has great merit and will be very helpful to many members of our great teaching profession who are engaged in such vital work.

Dr. Roy's splendid summary is contained in a recent legislative bulletin of the Massachusetts Teachers Association and since the article was deemed to be of great importance it was printed in a special edition of this bulletin so that it would be available to the members.

The article follows:

MASSACHUSETTS TEACHERS ASSOCIATION LEGISLATIVE BULLETIN ON H.R. 10933

On April 6, 1964, the Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN, a Member of Congress representing the Third Congressional District of Massachusetts, filed H.R. 10933 in the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

WHAT IS THE NATURE AND CONTENT OF H.R. 10933?

The purpose of H.R. 10933 is to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and it would authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (which would include certain travel) undertaken by them and further it would provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deductions.

The bill provides that a statement from an authorized school official would be acceptable as proof (in the absence of clear proof to the contrary) that such education was appropriate for maintaining or improving skills of a teacher, or to meet the express requirement of his employer.

For purposes of clarification this proposal defines a teacher and lists aspects of educational needs to meet the proposal. These include:

1. Professional requirements by school committees.
2. Relationship of course, travel, or activity to teacher's assignment.
3. Relationship of improvement of skills to individual's position.
4. Recognition of course, travel, activity by college or university, and it excludes any course, travel, or other activity if not directly related to position.
5. Provisions so that all educational expenses shall be deductible in the same manner as travel, meals, and lodging is now deductible; i.e., from gross income.
6. The amendment which would become effective by this act, were it to become law, would apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this act.

DEFINITIONS

(a) This bill methodically defines a teacher as an individual employed by a school as a classroom teacher, or as a supervisor, administrator, or adviser, or in any other professional capacity related to the instructional program inclusive of guidance counselors and librarians.

(b) The term education comprises any course, travel, or any educational activity which:

1. Is a requirement by the teacher's employer (school committee) to meet the specific requirements of his employment, or
2. Is within the area of employment (including the subject area, grade level, or other area) in which the teacher performs his duties as such or is directly related to such area, or
3. Is directly related to the improvement of the teaching, administrative, or other skills of the teacher, including but not limited to courses in eduaction, psychology, sociology, anthropology, English, the language of the student involved where English is a second language, guidance, administration, library, science and audio-visual techniques, or
4. Is allowed by the institution of higher learning at or by which it is offered or made available as a credit toward an advanced degree in the area in which the teacher is employed.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

This definition does not include any course, travel, or other activity if it is undertaken primarily for the purpose of qualifying for a type of employment which is different from that in which the teacher is engaged at the time it is undertaken.

In the opinion of some to keep pace with space is merely a problem of technology. We as educators are asked to prepare more individuals to meet the challenges of the times. To do so means, in part, that we must do more studying, pursue more courses, visit, travel, participate in studies and research in order that we be prepared to instruct and direct our youth to meet the problem of the age of space, an age of change which has echoed throughout life in America.

Professional travel should definitely be recognized. The writer knows of one case where an individual has made two trips abroad to strengthen his background and to allow him to acquire firsthand information about his area of interest, art. This individual has taken more than 1,000 slides on his tours. Much of his experience has been basic in establishing a specific course in art appreciation. The individual is planning to return to Europe again this summer. We believe that this definitely should be considered professional improvement and be tax deductible. As we understand the proposed bill, it would be tax deductible.

This particular bill can be considered a must for the profession. May I suggest you write to the Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN and thank him for filing H.R. 10933. Each of us should write to our Senators, the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and the Honorable EDWARD KENNEDY, and to our Congressmen for the support of this bill.

Recently William Herbert, your present assistant executive secretary and member of the National Education Association Legislative Commission, and I visited Washington on official business. We found the Massachusetts Members of the Senate and Congress most congenial. They are interested to know how their constituents are thinking about various bills. Check with them personally. Mention H.R. 10933.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: The Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the official reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the official reporters of the respective Houses.

The official reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the official reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

(Mr. MORTON (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I had expected to vote for H.R. 11049 to adjust basic compensation of many Federal employees and officers of the Government as well as the members of the legislative branch. Having studied the bill and the committee report, I felt there was adequate justification to make at this time an adjustment in compensation for the many dedicated employees of the Government and for Members of Congress who obviously are having a difficult time making ends meet.

I understand the management requirements for keeping Government compensation, wherever practical, in line with compensation for equal work and for equal responsibility throughout the commercial sector of our economy. I believe this cannot be done by any automatic device or formula. I believe it has to be done as a management decision and must be undertaken as a basic responsibility of the Congress.

When the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] was adopted, it then became the intent of the Congress to automatically couple congressional compensation and the compensation of literally thousands of Federal employees to that of the commercial sector of the economy. Having served for many years on the salary and compensation committees of corporations in which the economic lives of more than 25,000 families have been involved, I conclude by experience that arbitrary formulas for adjusting compensation related to any specific indices or economic factors can be very risky business from a management point of view.

In many specific cases, industry compensation level for supervisory, intermediate executive, and higher executive responsibilities are correlated to Government rates of pay and determined on a comparability factor involving the various salaries which we here in this act are trying to correlate to industry. Therefore, it is very likely that the proposed policy for determining compensation in the Government will have an inflationary and upward spiraling effect on the compensation in industry and vice versa.

It was only a few short weeks ago when the President of the United States in a plea to both labor and management asked for stabilization of price and salary. It seems to me that the philosophy of this bill as changed by the Udall amendment is in direct conflict with the spirit of the President's desire. Therefore, in an effort to hold the line against inflation, I voted against the bill.

WASTE WON'T HELP WIN WAR ON POVERTY

(Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, almost everyone who becomes slightly or deeply involved with the Area Redevelopment Administration decides that the whole program should be thoroughly investigated by a committee of Congress before any more funds are appropriated for its use.

If we waste money intended for the poor, many of the needy who are entitled to, and deserving of, assistance will be neglected.

The sooner a full-scale investigation of ARA is instituted the better.

The following editorial from the Register-Guard of Eugene, Oreg., of June 2, 1964, indicates the view of many thoughtful citizens who are concerned about the Federal programs designed to fight real poverty.

WASTE WON'T HELP WIN WAR ON POVERTY

In reality, war against poverty has been underway in this Nation for three decades and more. And there has been little disagreement about the moral basis for this crusade.

There has been, however, and there continues to be, considerable disagreement about tactics employed by the Federal Government in its efforts to spearhead a national antipoverty offensive.

While he was President, John F. Kennedy did a superb job of dramatizing the importance of the battle. And, since he has been President, Lyndon B. Johnson has used both his own practical political know-how and emotions stirred by President Kennedy's assassination to promote this as an all-out struggle.

There remain, however, dedicated critics of, not what the war on poverty should accomplish, but of how it is being waged. Establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, for instance, has had foes who believe it would not strike effectively at root causes of unemployment. And some Federal antipoverty programs already in progress have been judged ineffective, or, worse, as liabilities in the overall campaign.

The low-cost Federal lending program of the Area Redevelopment Administration was blasted in exactly this fashion when Reader's Digest published a May lead article querulously titled, "Is This the Way to Fight the War Against Poverty?"

And this obviously stung the ARA newspapers across the country have now been furnished booklets rebutting the magazine's allegations. And each has been informed that Reader's Digest has been asked to publish ARA's "side" of the controversy.

In essence, ARA's circular denies that it has exceeded its intended purpose, or that it has issued ill-advised loans to help industries, or, that its operations have not been effective in creating net increases in jobs available where jobs are critically needed.

Extensive investigation would be required to determine a winner in the argument between Reader's Digest and the ARA. However, it is a matter of record that ARA last year failed to convince Congress that it should be more liberally supplied with funds to loan applicants in "poverty pockets" about the Nation. And, even in its response to the Reader's Digest article, ARA does not deny that it would consider issuing loans in one-third of all U.S. counties.

In our own part of the country, ARA-supported projects have been consistently opposed for 2 years by Western Timber Industry, a trade newspaper published in Portland. A recent issue carried a lengthy, heavily documented "condensation" of a talk presented by WTI Editor Vernon S. White at the annual session of the Northwest Wood Products Clinic.

Here, again, it would be no easy task to make an accurate assessment of allegations that the ARA is oeprating "to spend money at a maximum rate of speed so as to justify to Congress the appropriation of still more funds * * * and to line up the votes to keep in office a President and Congress friendly to it."

But one fact does stand out in all of this. The ARA was originally established as an emergency apparatus to be employed only for 4 years. That term will be ending in 1965. Before ARA is given a permanent or a semipermanent role in the war on poverty, its policies and their net results should be carefully scrutinized. And the same procedure should be followed with regard to other Federal agencies being mustered into this fight. Federal funds are needed to help combat persistent poverty in some parts of the Nation. But Congress, proceeding with antipoverty legislation, should take care to invest taxes where they will really benefit the Nation's poor.

THE NEED FOR MASS TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the reasons and need for the mass transportation bill has nowhere been more clearly spelled out than in an article by Wolf Von Eckardt appearing in the Washington Post of Sunday, June 14, 1964. As Mr. Von Eckardt puts it:

Transportation means life. People and goods must be able to get around quickly, efficiently, and conveniently if our cities are to survive. It is as simple as that.

The present strangulation of our metropolitan centers, large and small, cannot be allowed to continue. Although the major portion of the burden must be borne by the localities and States themselves, there is a legitimate role for the Federal Government to take. A significant step in the fulfillment of that role would be the passage of the mass transportation bill, authorizing Federal aid amounting to $500 million over a 3-year period.

I believe that on both sides of the aisle there is now sufficient realization of the justification for this bill to obtain a favorable vote in the House. It passed the other body, more than a year ago, and I urge the House leadership to place this legislation on its priority list for immediate action.

The article by Mr. Von Eckardt follows:

HOUSE CAN START TRAFFIC MOVING AGAIN

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

The House of Representatives willing, the next few days could see a decisive turning point in the plight of the American city—passage of the long delayed Mass Transportation Act.

Transportation means life. People and goods must be able to get around quickly, efficiently, and conveniently if our cities are to survive. It is as simple as that.

The mass transportation bill (H.R. 3881), which passed the Senate more than a year ago, would make $500 million in Federal funds available to help cities plan and build new railroad communter and mass transit services and improve existing facilities. It would provide money for public transporta-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

tion research and development and transportation planning.

It would not, as some people seem to fear, repeal the automobile or reduce sensible highway construction. Automobiles and trucks perform an essential function, even in the very heart of the city, that no other form of transportation can take away from them. We must therefore continue to try and adjust out cities to the motor age. And no highway engineer, road contractor or other highway builder need fear that he will lose his job or income.

But the highway builders cannot possibly do the whole job. The automobile is, of course, among the greatest blessings of our time. It gets more people around to more places than their grandparents ever dreamed of. It accounts largely for our high standard of living.

Now we must translate this high standard of living into a high standard of life.

This, for the 8 out of 10 Americans who now live in metropolitan areas, means urban life. And the quality, serenity, safety, health and welfare of our urban environment is threatened by the uncontrolled proliferation of the automobile and our almost exclusive reliance on it as a means of moving about.

Its insatiable demand for more highways and freeways and loops and parking spaces ruthlessly displaces people and buildings. It pollutes our air. Its traffic jams choke commerce and steal time away from leisure. People and stores are forced out into the open countryside, covering it with endless urban sprawl.

All this is fiercely expensive, taking an increasingly larger share of our national income. The total State and Federal expenditure for highways has increased about 123 percent between 1950 and 1960. The total national income in the same period increased only 50 percent.

Many people assume that automobile transportation pays for itself. They say that gasoline taxes, tolls, and fees paid by car and truck owners bring in the money needed for building, maintaining, and policing highways. But this is an error.

The money collected from highway users by the States pays just about what the States themselves spend on their highways. But these State expenditures are heavily augmented—up to 90 percent—by the Federal Government from taxes paid by all of us, whether we use highways or not.

It is therefore only reasonable that Federal tax money also be used to augment highways with mass transit. In fact, it is much less expensive.

To build a commuter railway capable of carrying 80,000 passengers from a New York suburb to the city, it has recently been estimated, would cost $283 million. To carry the same number of people on new highways would cost $4,752 million—a ratio of 1 to 16.

If the commuter rail service in New York, Chicago, Boston, Cleveland, and Philadelphia were to break down, it would cost $31 billion to build the highways needed to move the resulting increase in automobile traffic. Where, furthermore, would these cities put the additional cars? And what would be left of the cities if they were slashed by still more highways?

Bringing existing commuter rail service up to date and building new rapid transit systems in the cities that desperately need them—and Washington is one of them—can therefore no longer be delayed.

Many people, it is true, sneer at the idea of straphanging, no matter how tiresome it is to push their cars through traffic. They mentally associate rapid transit riding with the crowded, grimy subways of New York. They forget that most of these subways are half a century old.

The trouble is that the rapid transit manufacturers and advocates have woefully failed to whet our appetites for their product. The sketches of visionary subway trains and stations their engineers concoct are less than alluring.

Few people are therefore able to imagine the potential comfort and efficiency of riding to and from work in a truly modern train: Your wife drives you to the nearby suburban station. You kiss her good-bye and enter a glistening clean, noiseless, air-conditioned train. On your way to your seat you pick up a cup of coffee and the newspaper. Before you've even finished the funnies you have arrived. There's a short, bracing walk to your office and you start the day fresh and relaxed. At the end of the day you are home even before you have figured out what to do with the time you have saved.

New buildings and communities, furthermore, would tend to cluster around the new rapid transit stops. There would be urban concentration instead of urban sprawl and thus hope to save both the city and the open countryside.

President Johnson, for all these reasons, wants the mass transportation bill enacted. At latest count 40 Republican House Members are supporting it.

The House leadership now must break the legislative traffic jam in which the bill is caught if there is to be hope that we can break the traffic jams in our cities. They are a good part of the reason why an Englishman recently referred to our urban environment as "the mess that is manmade America."

EXTENSION OF THE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH OFFENSES CONTROL ACT OF 1961

(Mr. BARRY (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, a modern society brings with it many good and wonderful things; it brings better health, better living standards, more leisure, more culture—to more people. These are the fruits of progress. But there are weeds in the garden of the modern society—elements which are not so good and so wonderful.

Juvenile delinquency has been a recurrent problem and has spread, weedlike, at a rate which justifiably alarms us. We have watched it sprout especially in the last decade and we have tried to find the best way to stem its prolific growth.

Most of these remedies have a great deal of merit. They attack the problem with understanding and deligence. But they have had distinct limitations. Either they have served too few young people to make appreciable gains against delinquency or they have concentrated on only one or two of the elements of a social illness which, we have discovered, has many facets.

There is one statement that can undisputedly be made about this problem whose solution evades us. Its causes are so manifold and complex—slum housing, ill health, family disintegration, racial discrimination, lack of recreational facilities, inadequate education, unemployment—that an overriding sense of hopelessness often deters action. Most juvenile delinquents have more than one of these problems and most of the proposed remedies have been too narrow in scope.

Today the House is considering H.R. 9876, a bill to extend for 2 years the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. This bill has many merits, not the least of which is its recognition of the multifaceted nature of the juvenile delinquency problem.

About half of the funds authorized under H.R. 9876 are earmarked for demonstration projects—projects which, in 3 years of operation of the Juvenile Delinquency Act, are pointing to new solutions to our problems. These projects are based on careful planning—a lengthy and involved procedure which has drawn fire from critics of the bill. But insistence on thorough planning has made these programs blueprints for future action.

The object of demonstration projects under the Juvenile Delinquency Act is to attack all sources of delinquency by using the talents and services of all elements of the community—public and private, individual and collective. If these well-planned, well coordinated, fully comprehensive programs can make inroads against delinquency in their communities—and I think that the experience of the past 3 years have shown they can—then we have found a model for positive community action for the future. The other major section of the bill is a training program for youth personnel—teachers, policemen, parole officers, welfare workers, and the like. These training programs have been set up to work in coordination with the demonstration projects and are based on the premise that action programs can be no more effective than the persons who carry them out.

The cost of this program is small compared to the good it can accomplish. We have evidence that considerable progress has been made in the operating demonstration projects and that we cannot discontinue this program while the task is still incomplete. I do not wish to be unrealistic and imply that demonstration projects in a score of cities will rid us permanently of juvenile delinquency. Instead we must consider the funds we invest as "seed money"—money to stimulate other action projects on the community level in other cities.

In my State of New York, we have serious delinquency problems—since delinquency is greatest in our largest cities and New York State is the home of the largest. Up to this point, we have been unsuccessful in decreasing delinquency. Youth crime has risen precipitously in the past 14 years, a rise which has far outstripped the juvenile population growth. Let us continue a program which, in 3 short years of operation, has offered progress toward the solutions. We do not intend that this program be extended indefinitely. The victory over youth crime must be fought within the community with community people leading the way. This program will blaze the trail for local community initiative.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CONTROL ACT

(Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

overvalued currency. And what is happening in India is typical of what is happening in other underdeveloped countries into which we have been pouring taxpayers' dollars.

When, if ever, are we going to use foreign aid to encourage sound currencies, balanced budgets, private property, free enterprise, and increased productivity?

John F. Kennedy Resolution Adopted by the United Steelworkers of America, District 20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 16, 1964

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, I had the privilege of speaking to delegates of the 21st District 20 Conference of the United Steelworkers of America at Aliquippa, Pa., in my congressional district.

The 21st District 20 Conference was dedicated by unanimous vote of every delegate present in the local union No. 1211 auditorium during the morning of June 5 to the memory of John F. Kennedy, our beloved President.

Mr. Speaker, a special resolution was adopted in memoriam of President Kennedy and I ask unanimous consent to have same printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

JOHN F. KENNEDY—IN MEMORIAM

On November 22, 1963, an assassin's bullets stunned the Nation and wiped the smile from the lips of the entire civilized world. In a moment of brutality the life of John F. Kennedy was ended and the Nation stood shocked and suffering under a great sense of national shame.

The people of the world lost a courageous leader in the struggle for peace. Humanity lost a dedicated advocate of human rights, human dignity, and social justice whose fearless battle against bigotry and hatred had earned for him a respect throughout the world which few men realize in their lifetime.

At the moment when our grief and shame over this criminal act was the greatest we came to realize the love and affection that a strife torn world had for this American and knew that our loss was shared by millions of men and women throughout the world.

We, in the United Steelworkers of America, lost a friend who had so endeared himself to us that he was accorded honorary membership in our union. We came to love and respect him because he shared his dreams and hopes with us and made a place for us in his heart and in his deeds.

He understood our problems and needs more than any one man in recent history. We took him into our hearts because he understood our laughter and our tears.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy was a man of intellect, educated far beyond the realm of steelworkers. His ideals were high. He was a man of principle and dedication. But somehow he remained common enough to be loved by the common man.

He was loved and respected because his ideals and principles grew from his own great love for people and for all humanity.

Even in death the principles for which he lived, the programs and goals he so courageously developed and sought, may yet become a living tribute to this great man.

We can give life to John Fitzgerald Kennedy by following the course he charted.

We can give meaning to his death by pledging ourselves, individually and collectively, to the battle against bigotry and hatred wherever it exists.

We, the steelworkers of district 20, deem it fitting and proper that we dedicate this 21st district conference to the memory of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the 35th President of the United States of America, and in so doing, pledge ourselves to continue the fight against poverty and hunger, bigotry, hatred, and war to which in life he had so courageously dedicated himself.

Respectfully sumbitted.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
MORROS E. BRUMMITT,
President.
MICHAEL J. ZAHORSKY,
Recording Secretary.

Seal.
Date: May 22, 1964.

Great Smoky Mountains National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 16, 1964

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 30th anniversary of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. During the summer and autumn months millions of Americans will be traveling throughout the country seeing its wonders first hand. One of the truly great scenic attractions are the Great Smokies in the southern Appalachians of Tennessee-North Carolina. The Smokies are the most visited of all our national parks. Over 5 million tourists each year enjoy its camping grounds, streams, museums, lodges, and restaurants. There are over 650 miles of trails for hiking and horseback riding. The flora and fauna in the 507,654 acres are among the most beautiful in the world. There have been identified 1,300 kinds of flowering plants, 200 different kinds of birds, 50 species of animals and rainbow and brook trout swim in over 600 miles of streams.

So during this 30th birthday year of the Great Smokies I would like to urge my colleagues and all Americans to vacation in the Appalachian Mountains and enjoy one of the most beautiful spots in the whole world.

Under unanimous consent I place an article from the June 14, 1964, Washington Post on the Smoky Mountains in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, GREAT SMOKY, OLDEST NATIONAL PARK IN THE EAST

Great Smoky, host to more than 5 million travelers each year, marks the 30th anniversary of its formal establishment as a national park on Monday.

The birthday coincides with the peak of early summer blossomtime in the southern Appalachians and the beginning of the top travel months for the mountain vacationlands.

The park today looks much as it did when the pioneers began their westward trek across the southern Appalachians although it is the most visted national park in the country and the first to be located in the east.

Just a short walk from any motor road in the park is wilderness. Its 507,654 forested acres (half in North Carolina, half in Tennessee) contain almost as many different hardwoods as there are in all of Europe. Because of the altitude, vegetation is more that of Canada than Carolina and there is the most extensive stand of virgin red spruce in eastern America.

Black bears are the largest of the more than 50 species of animals native to the park area. Some 1,300 kinds of flowering plants have been identified in the Great Smokies. Showiest are the crimson-red rhododendron, mountain laurel and flame azaleas which bloom from early to late June.

Over 200 different kinds of birds make the park their seasonal or year round habitat. Some 600 miles of streams abound in rainbow, brook and brown trout. Fishing season in the park is May 16 to August 31, with some special areas set aside for junior anglers.

The Great Smokies Divide, one of the oldest uplands on earth, zigzags for 71 miles through the park from northeast to southwest. For 36 miles along its main crest the range maintains an altitude in excess of 5,000 feet. Sixteen of its peaks rise to more than 6,000 feet. The deep blue haze rising from the valleys gives these mountains the name of "Great Smoky."

Expansion and improvement of park facilities has been accelerated within the past few years through the "Mission 66" program of the National Park Service. Within the park are some 75 miles of paved high-standard roads and equal mileage of improved secondary roads.

U.S. 441, crossing Newfound Gap on the North Carolina-Tennessee line at 5,053 feet, is the main traffic artery through the park. Soaring even higher is the 11-mile park road to the overlook near the top of Clingman's Dome, highest peak (6,642 feet) in the Great Smokies. In 1959, the National Park Service completed an observation tower at the highest point on the Dome.

There are 650 miles of trails for hiking and horseback riding in the park. They range from short self-guided trails in areas of special interest to 71 miles of the famed Appalachian Trail running from Maine to Georgia.

There are six developed campgrounds for family tents and travel trailers, and an equal number of "primitive campgrounds" in more remote areas. There are campground stores and riding stables operated by concessioners. Museums and restorations relate the history of the area's early settlers, and the park interpretive program features conducted nature walks and illustrated lectures to help visitors understand the Great Smokies' flora, fauna, and geology.

Other than campsites and the concessioner-operated LeConte Lodge, there are no overnight accommodations in the park, but within a few minutes drive of the main entrances are a wide variety of privately developed motor lodges, inns, amusement areas, restaurants, and shopping centers.

In 1962 Great Smoky became the first national park to welcome 5 million visitors within a single year. As its popularity has increased, the surrounding "Land of the Sky" has been steadily developed for tourism. Residents of the adjacent areas—including the Cherokee Indians—have expanded their tourist facilities. State and Federal highways have been improved. Promotion of the area has been stepped up.

Construction has proceeded on the Blue Ridge Parkway, begun in the 1930's by the National Park Service to provide a vacation route between Shenandoah National Park in Virginia and Great Smoky. The parkway met the Great Smoky Mountains National Park on June 26, 1959, when its southermost link

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

—13 miles between Soco Gap on U.S. 19, and U.S. 441 near Cherokee and the North Carolina entrance to the park—was opened. Over 400 miles of the 469-mile parkway motor road are open for travel this year.

(An informative booklet on Great Smoky Mountains National Park is sold by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25. It costs 15 cents.)

Report of Panamanian Outbreak Inquiry: Who'll Hear the Verdict?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 16, 1964

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House on June 11, 1964, my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], quoted the report of the investigating committee of the International Commission of Jurists of Geneva, Switzerland, on the Panamanian mob assaults of January 1964 in the Canal Zone. Because of its importance as an antidote for the flood of mendacious news stories that flooded the mass news media in the United States following the Red-led riots, I urge that the report quoted in Representative SULLIVAN'S address be read by every Member of the Congress and every official in the executive branch who is concerned with Panama Canal policy matters.

Among the first thoughtful and objective reactions to the report was an editorial in the Washington Daily News, which appeals to other major organs of publicity to undo the harm done our country by "cynical, lying propaganda and fuzzy-headed sentimentality" that featured most reporting on the bloody Panamanian violence of last January against the Canal Zone.

The indicated editorial follows:

WHO'LL HEAR THE VERDICT?

The United States stands today found not guilty of Panama's accusation that it had violated human rights, as described in articles 3, 5, and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations.

This verdict of innocent comes from the very international organization which Panama's own bar association invited to hear the charges and examine the evidence.

The exoneration will not surprise readers of the Washington Daily News and the other Scripps-Howard newspapers which told the facts from the very beginning of last January's bloody riots.

It will, however, give a new slant to thousands and thousands of citizens who read the bad reporting and biased comment published elsewhere in the United States, in Latin America, in Europe, and particularly in Panama itself, where the violence of last January was chronicled with a dishonesty seldom equaled even in a press noted for its habitual and deliberate inattention to fact.

So the important thing today is not that this exoneration now rests in the official file; the important thing is whether it will be allowed to undo—as far as is belatedly possible—the worldwide harm that cynical, lying propaganda and fuzzy-headed sentimentality combined to do.

Will citizens who were told that the United States had committed a bloody and brutal aggression now get a chance to read the true story which the International Commission of Jurists put in its report?

Will they get a chance to learn that the commission found:

That Panama's authorities refrained from even trying to curb the attacking Panamanian rioters and snipers?

That the Panamanian National Guard was deliberately kept away from trouble spots for 3 days?

That Panamanian radio, television, and newspapers—owned by Panama's ruling families, including those which ran the Government then and now—"incited and misinformed" the people? This is a particularly sinister finding.

That although the United States at times during the fighting "may" have used force "somewhat in excess of what was absolutely necessary," that force was needed and that it was right for the United States to exercise it?

That the Panamanian rioters fired twice as many rounds at the defenders as were fired by the Canal Zone forces?

That, contradicting the then President Chiari, who said the riots were "spontaneous," there was "deliberate and extensive" use of bombs, Molotov cocktails, and so on, which indicated "premeditation and planning"?

Marco A. Robles, Panama's new President-elect, was until 1963 outgoing President Chiari's Minister of Government. He tried to disassociate himself from the corruption and inefficiency of the Chiari regime, but the plain fact is, that after the January riots he embraced the Government's position.

He could help greatly to clear the atmosphere and keep it calm if, now that he has been elected President, he would use his position and prestige to put the record straight for Panama's citizens.

He can do it if he will, and we know of nothing that would do more to create the climate of confidence and trust that both sides need if new arrangements are to be made over the Panama Canal's operation and finances.

What's Happened?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 16, 1964

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with passage by the House of the salary grab bill, the Mason City, Iowa, Globe-Gazette—in an editorial in its June 13 issue—properly inquires as to what has happened to President Johnson's celebrated guideposts for wage settlements in 1964.

Repeatedly, Johnson has called upon business and labor leaders to exercise "restraint and responsibility" to the end that prices and wages will remain stable and prevent another spiral of inflation.

The administration has suggested that wage hikes be held to 3.2 percent. However, as the Globe-Gazette editorial suggests, how can Walter Reuther and company be expected to react favorably to this suggestion when Members of Congress—with the backing of the White House—vote themselves a salary increase of 33 percent?

If this latest raid on the Treasury is finally adopted, it will give Members of Congress a salary increase of between 130 and 140 percent since 1955.

Following is the excellent editorial from the Mason City newspaper:

LET'S GET THE FACTS

Well, now, what's happened to the Johnson administration's celebrated guideposts for wage settlements in 1964?

This policy suggests that labor and management act responsibly in contract negotiations, holding any wage hikes to 3.2 percent.

That must apply to "the other people."

The House has passed a Government pay raise bill by a vote of 243 to 157. Pushing all the way was President Johnson and company.

The bill boosts salaries of Members of Congress by 33 percent—up $7,500 to $30,000. Similar increases would be handed around to other major Government officials.

In addition, it would grant increases ranging from 5 to 22.5 percent for employees of the legislative branch. Lesser amounts would be granted to 1.7 million civil service employees. Typical would be a $310 increase for secretaries.

This is the second go-around for a Federal pay raise bill.

Insistence on a rollcall vote by Iowa Representative H. R. Gross, Republican, of Waterloo, on an earlier bill brought about its defeat.

Since, new information has been offered.

The Office of Business Economics says that the average yearly earnings of each fulltime employee in private business rose from $4,238 in 1957 to $5,014 in 1962 or 18 percent.

Average pay of Federal civilian workers, computed on the same basis, went up 31 percent from $4,971 to $6,506, while pay of State-local employees increased 27 percent from $3,958 to $5,014.

In the same period, the consumer's price index went up less than 8 percent.

Commenting on this information the Tax Foundation, Inc., a private organization, noted that U.S. employees "generally have had six salary increases in the years 1955–64."

It also noted that the 2.5 million fulltime Federal worker receives an average of $559 a month compared to the $457 average for some 6.3 million fulltime State-local employees.

These are blanket figures. Some areas in private employment have fared better than in public employment and vice-versa.

There undoubtedly are areas in which some Federal employees deserve larger increases than in others.

But Senators need all the facts before shoving through the new wage proposal that will cost an estimated $533 million annually.

Meanwhile, back in the labor halls, Walter Reuther and company must be geefully filing any information on the "3.2 policy" in the nearest wastebasket.

Extend Insured Housing Loan Program for Elderly

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES HARVEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 15, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has well summed up the action of our committee on this bill. It was re-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Whereas the mushroom growing and canning industry is one of the foundation stones of Pennsylvania's agricultural economy, gainfully employing thousands of workers who produce a useful and unique product consumed throughout the Nation; and

Whereas the continued existence of this great Pennsylvania industry as a viable force in our economy is now in dire jeopardy due to a torrential flood of low-priced imports from a single cheap labor country which have mounted to nearly 50 percent of domestic production in less than 3 years; resulting in wholesale bankruptcies and hardship to Pennsylvania farmers and canners; and

Whereas every factor indicates even greater future onslaughts which will surely sound the death knell of a great American industry located primarily in the State of Pennsylvania: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania requests his excellency, William W. Scranton, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to intercede on behalf of the people of this Commonwealth and the mushroom industry with the President of the United States and the U.S. Tariff Commission to impose tariffs on the import of mushrooms of a sufficient amount to make them competitive with the domestic mushroom industry; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize Congress to take whatever steps may be necessary to protect the weakening and declining domestic mushroom industry, and restore the same to a competitive market; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Gov. William W. Scranton; President Lyndon B. Johnson; U.S. Tariff Commission; the presiding officer of each House of Congress of the United States; and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

Attest:

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Bobby Baker case is not yet closed. Considerable monkey business is going on, on which I shall have a report later.

SALARY INCREASE BILL AS PASSED IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD BE DEFEATED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the House of Representatives recently passed a pay increase bill applicable to all three branches of the Federal Government, which, if enacted into law, will be an unconscionable raid on the public Treasury. The legislative proposal will cost American taxpayers more than one-half billion dollars a year. This would be only the beginning. History teaches we may be assured that within the next 2 years another pay increase bill will be introduced in the Congress. Also, as the Federal bureaucracy grows, the price tag for this increase will grow with it.

I cannot in good conscience support the proposed pay increase bill in its present form. I will vote against it. It is my feeling that at least four separate legislative proposals were arbitrarily lumped together in one bill providing a pay increase for: First, postal employees, classified civil service employees, and all other members of the executive branch; second, the Federal judiciary; third, employees on the staffs of Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate; and fourth, Members of Congress.

As for the so-called overworked staff assistants, they always seem to have plenty of time to line the walls of the Chamber in the afternoon and evening when business is being conducted here and when Senators are working. These staff members are listening out of curiosity. They would receive an increase under the bill.

Of these four general groups, it is my judgment that postal employees, including letter carriers, are the most deserving of a further increase in pay at this time. As for classified civil service employees, I do not believe that it is necessary to raise the salaries of all Federal employees in order to lure competent people for the 1,000 or 2,000 positions for which increased salaries are justified. If there are certain Federal positions for which there is proof that a higher salary level is needed to attract competent people, then let these jobs be named specifically and let specific legislation be enacted to correct the problem.

It is my observation that most Government employees in Washington and elsewhere are and have been well paid in comparison with those doing the same work in private industry. Furthermore, those who are in the classified civil service have job security and fringe and retirement benefits far superior to any employees in private industry.

Mr. President, those most deserving of a pay raise are postal workers, including letter carriers, clerks, and supervisors and perhaps some civil service employees whose services really merit increased compensation. A legislative proposal to accomplish this should be debated and enacted upon separate and apart from the present bill. I had hoped to have an opportunity to vote on a bill which would include a pay raise for postal employees and certain civil service employees. Such legislation, I believe, would pass overwhelmingly.

As for congressional salaries, it is my view that the Congress must set an example by holding the line on wage costs. The proposed $7,500 increase for Representatives and Senators is a 33⅓-percent increase at a time when the President has urged a maximum hold-the-line raise of 3.2 percent in wages and prices. I seriously question whether there would be any additional candidates for election to the Congress because of the proposed pay raise. No doubt the same men and women would be elected or returned to the Congress. The fact is that very few men and women of high achievement in private life would at the present time refuse appointment or certain election to the Senate of the United States or the House of Representatives.

The bill passed by the House of Representatives contains a device for automatic pay increases for Members of Congress. It provides for automatic adjustment of salaries of Members of Congress, Cabinet members, and top Government officials whenever pay increases are given to all Government employees in the future. This is laden with serious consequences. It would relieve Members of Congress of the necessity of proving that they are entitled to future increases. It would severely damage the prestige which the Congress holds and should hold in the estimation of Americans. It might tempt subsequent Congresses to grant employees raises indiscriminately. It is interesting to note that no provision is made for lowering the salaries of the Members of Congress when the cost-of-living index goes down. This is an interesting type of sliding scale; it only slides up.

Regarding Federal judges, it is well known that whenever there is a vacancy on the Federal bench, many, sometimes hundreds, of competent lawyers seek the appointment. There are at most but a few hundred lawyers in our Nation, who, if offered an appointment to the Federal bench, would not accept. Although there may be some, it is extremely doubtful that a lawyer would refuse appointment as U.S. judge at $22,500 a year and agree to accept were the salary to be increased to $30,000. I would like to know the name of one man in the Nation who would refuse appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court, the highest honor a lawyer may receive, solely because this position pays $35,000 a year and not $42,500.

It should be remembered that in addition to the prestige and other emoluments that accrue to a member of the Federal bench, these judges enjoy their salaries as long as they live whether they continue to serve actively or whether they retire following 10 years of service having attained the age of 70. Furthermore, following 10 years' service as Federal judge, in event of permanent disability may be retired at full salary. Talk about job security, they have it for life with all the trimmings.

There are Federal judges today in Ohio and in most other States who have reached retirement age and could have retired years ago. Evidently, they do not feel that they are being underpaid as many continue to serve actively well beyond the retirement age of 3 score and 10.

We constantly hear that the Federal Government must be competitive with private industry. Private industry bases its pay scale on profits. Where profits are great, salaries in many instances are supercolossal. I make no complaint about this. However, no such factor governs the Federal Government's payroll. Our Government's only source of income for paying salaries is the taxpayer who already is bearing a heavy burden.

The purpose of Government is service whereas the purpose of industry is profit.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

If the goal is to try to match the pay scale of private industry, then we must accept the fact that the proposed bill is only the first installment. Further requests will make the present legislative proposal look miserly. We should realize that the Federal Government should not match the salaries of private industry. We shall always have to rely to a marked degree on many citizens to serve their government as their lives' work. That is as it should be.

It is fair to say that citizens generally wish public officials to be paid adequately. It would be foreign to our American way of life were Congressmen, for example, to be denied adequate compensation. It would be unfortunate were only men and women born to great wealth, or who had acquired great wealth, able to afford to occupy public office, elective, or appointive. No one wants that. On the other hand in my judgment the House of Representatives has come forth with overly generous and, in fact, outrageously high salary recommendations. It appears to me that there should be separate legislative proposals for the different categories of Federal employees involved.

Having studied the present proposal, it is my judgment that this is not the time to indulge in self-indulgence. This is not the time to indiscriminately fatten the already well-larded Federal payroll. Our national economy simply cannot afford the luxury of this bill at this time.

Therefore, after full and thorough consideration, I cannot, I repeat, in good conscience vote for the bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, on June 13, 1964, there appeared in the Plain Dealer, one of the great newspapers of the Nation, an excellent editorial entitled "House Builds in Pay Raises." I commend this to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this place in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Plain Dealer, June 13, 1964]

HOUSE BUILDS IN PAY RAISES

The device for automatic pay raises for Congressmen should be soundly defeated in the U.S. Senate.

The latest House wrinkle, whereby elected and appointed officials from the Vice President down would get a proportionate increase every time Congress voted a pay boost for classified Federal Government workers, is reprehensible.

Congressmen, under the House-approved pay boost measure, would not have to make a public or convincing plea for more money. The bill could tempt subsequent Congresses to grant employee pay raises, in effect voting itself bigger paychecks, too.

It would severely damage the image of Congress in the eyes of the taxpayer.

In approving a salary boost for Federal employees that included a large increase for all legislators, the House continues to ride on the coattails of Federal Government personnel clearly deserving greater financial reward.

The Plain Dealer repeats its stand. Many of the most competent people in the Nation cannot afford to stay in Government because of salaries not commensurate with services rendered or the expense involved. The responsibility assumed by Cabinet members, for example, is far greater than the current $25,000 salary.

But a wage increase for top Government personnel and other Federal employees should be a separate measure, apart from a raise, however valid, for Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The House-approved measure would raise Congressmen's salaries by $7,500, from $22,500 to $30,000 per year. In March the House, by rollcall vote, defeated a proposal which would increase such salaries by $10,000. That measure did not contain the automatic raise amendment.

Among northeastern Ohioans in the House, only CHARLES A. VANIK, Democrat, of Cleveland, voted for this week's bill. Ohio's Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE has been quick to point out that $7,500 would be a 33-percent salary increase at a time when President Johnson has urged a maximum hold-the-line raise of 3.2 percent in wages and prices. He also has recalled that when Congress voted itself a raise in 1954, it was from $12,500 to $22,500, a whopping 80 percent. Under the House-passed pay hike bill, Congressmen would benefit from a 113-percent increase in 10 years.

The case for the increase in pay for most Government workers, from Cabinet members to postal employees, is strong.

The Senate should approve this without question. If it decides to go along with the raise for Congressmen, it at least should knock out the built-in raise provision.

COMMENDATION OF LEADERSHIP AND STAFF ON HANDLING OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in the closing hours of the debate on the civil rights, a great deal was said about the contribution that had been made by the majority leader, the minority leader, the majority whip, and the minority whip. I concur in all that was said about the devoted and perceptive work done by these Senators. They deserve every word of praise that has been given to them. May I add just a footnote. I would like to say something about the work that was done by the devoted staff who worked so tirelessly and yet so effectively on the civil rights bill. The bipartisan Civil Rights Newsletter that came to us daily brings this to my mind. These staff people not only knew the provisions of the bill down to the most minute detail, but they were in constant communication with all segments of the Senate at all times and provided the background and information that were needed by the Senators who were carrying the debate on the floor of the Senate. No one who has functioned as an executive of any type, and particularly a Senator, could fill adequately his position if he did not have devoted and able staff. In the bipartisan staff the Senate leadership had the best of help. I pay my tribute to these people.

INVESTIGATION OF PARTISAN POLITICAL FUNDRAISING IN THE CIVIL SERVICE—RESOLUTION CARRIED OVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolution 332, requesting the Attorney General to investigate partisan political fundraising in the civil service, which appears on page 12 of the Calendar of Business for today, not be laid before the Senate today under the rule, but that it be carried over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the resolution, as I understand, will go over but will retain the same status when it is laid before the Senate following the next adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall not object, because I realize that in the excitement and press of business last week, notice was not given that the resolution would come before the Senate today. Several Senators who are interested in the resolution are not present today. I shall not object to the resolution going over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, because it clarifies the situation. The consideration of the resolution deserves a little notice ahead of time.

INCREASING PARTICIPATION BY COUNTIES IN REVENUES FROM THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1039, S. 1363, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1363) to increase the participation by counties in revenues from the national wildlife refuge system by amending the act of June 15, 1935, relating to such participation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment. On page 2, after line 23, to strike out:

(c) The Secretary, at the end of each fiscal year, shall pay, out of the net receipts in the fund (after payment of necessary expenses) for such fiscal year, to those counties in which the aforesaid areas of the system are situated, which funds shall be expended solely for the benefit of the public schools and roads in those counties, as follows:

(1) an amount equal to 25 per centum of the net receipts collected by the Secretary under subsection (a) of this section from the reserved public lands in those areas of the System within each county: *Provided*, That when any such area is situated in more than one county the distributive share to each county from the aforesaid receipts shall be proportional to its acreage of such public lands therein; and

(2) an amount equal to three-fourths of 1 per centum of the cost of those areas of the System in each county acquired in fee by the United States, exclusive of any improvements to such areas made subsequent to Federal acquisition, such cost to be adjusted to represent current values as determined by the Secretary for the first full fiscal

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

lution control, which is closely connected to soil and water conservation; with "Wildlife and Conservation;" with "Soil Loss—The Long-Range View;" and with "Soil Conservation Practices." The one article points up the very close connection between conservation practices and the development and maintenance of wildlife populations:

POLLUTION CONTROL

The primary causes of stream pollution in Iowa streams are:

1. Untreated or improperly treated sewage from urban areas;
2. Industrial wastes; and
3. Siltation caused by movement of silt from eroding lands.

In the past 10 years much has been accomplished in the control of pollution from industrial plants and municipal sewage from urban areas. A number of industries, along with local, State, and Federal agencies, are conducting research for ways to reclaim waste and purify the water used. There are still many problems.

Greater emphasis is required in many areas of research in order to permit more rapid and effective control measures. Some of the problems urgently needing special attention are:

The impact on public health of increased bacterial, virus, and chemical pollution, and the ability of present processes to cope with increased volumes and new types of pollution.

A redefinition of the natural purification phenomena of streams in the light of the new composition of wastes, including chemical loadings.

The development of more economical waste treatment methods—success in this area would save millions of dollars of treatment plant construction cost.

Adjustment of laboratory techniques for measuring pollution levels in streams and for determining efficiency of water treatment.

The effect of impoundments on pollution behavior in streams.

Silt from eroded land is one of the serious pollution problems. Soil and water conservation land-treatment measures (including the use of vegetation and contour farming) on upland areas, combined with a structural program of soil stabilization and water and erosion-control structures, is a most important solution to this problem, all across the Nation as well as in Iowa. Each year much progress is made in this soil and water conservation program. Much more needs to be done, however. Considerable research is underway to determine the rates and amounts of sedimentation within watershed areas with the use of various types and combinations of land treatment use and structural measures.

In recent years there has been concern expressed that some chemicals used as insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, and fertilizers washed from the land into streams and underground water supplies may contribute to polluting such supplies. Research and investigation to determine the extent of this type of pollution is underway.

WILDLIFE AND CONSERVATION

A majority of Iowa farmers, through their interest and work in soil and water conservation, are making a major contribution to the habitat development of such forms of wildlife as pheasant, ducks, squirrels, and deer.

Today, more than 54,000 farmer-district cooperators in the State have complete soil and water conservation plans, many of which contribute directly to the enhancement of land for the propagation, development, and maintenance of wildlife populations.

Conservation cropping systems, contour farming, terracing, and stripcropping are conservation practices which provide benefits to wildlife populations. Practices which are of most direct benefit to wildlife are as follows:

Field border plantings: grassy headlands around crop fields left unmowed until after oats harvest time. This allows time for young birds to hatch and leave the nest. Iowa farmers have installed more than 89 million feet of such borders.

Hedgerow planting: Oftentimes a row of trees and shrubs—for example, honeysuckle—planted on the border of a field or across it. It frequently occurs as one or two rows of shrubs planted around a windbreak. More than 9½ million feet of these plantings have been made.

Windbreaks: Trees and shrubs planted around farmstead and feedlot provide food and cover for wildlife. More than 1,000 acres are so enclosed in Iowa.

Wildlife habitat development: Improvements for wildlife to include food, shelter, water, nesting cover, and other desirable features in a designated area. There are now 65,000 acres so developed.

Farm conservation ponds: Water impoundments for livestock and other uses. Water and surrounding areas always attract wildlife. About 25,000 ponds have been built and 18,000 of them stocked with fish.

Grassed waterways and outlets: Shaped shallow channels used to remove surface water runoff from the farm without erosion damage. The amount of cover for wildlife depends on the management of the grass in the channel. There are about 140,000 acres of such waterways on farms of district cooperators.

In addition to the value of separate practices, these practices in combination as found on land with conservation plans have a cumulative effect. Rotation cropping provides more variety and creates more edges. More species of wildlife are attracted.

In Iowa and nationally, progress of watershed projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act is increasing the acreage of good wildlife habitat.

SOIL LOSS—THE LONG-RANGE VIEW

Iowa's rich soils produce one-tenth of the Nation's total food supply. Much of Iowa soil is formed from material deposited, thousands of years ago, by the wind. This material is called loess. The loess soils are highly productive, deep, and easily eroded. Other Iowa soils will erode, too, when not protected by adequate conservation measures.

More than nine-tenths of Iowa land is in farms. And more than three-fourths of the farmland is used to grow crops—half of which are rowcrops that expose the soil to erosion unless conservation practices are carefully followed. Only about one-fifth of the farmland is in pasture and woods. And there is about 4 percent "other" farmland in farmsteads, lanes, roads, and some wildlife areas and idle land.

Iowa's highly productive soil is in demand and land prices are high. About one-half of Iowa's farmland is operated by tenants. This means intense cropping of large acreages, much under tillage that encourages erosion.

Some farm owners and operators, especially those with deep soils, are not aware of erosion losses. Some farmers discount the loss of up to 20 tons of soil per acre per year. Yet a 5-ton loss is considered the maximum if continuing good yields are to come.

Nevertheless, a well-developed soil and water conservation program is expanding in the State. All Iowa counties are now soil conservation districts. More than 40 percent of Iowa farmland is under cooperative agreement with districts, with the farmers applying conservation plans worked out with the help of the Soil Conservation Service.

But much still remains to be done:

Treatment for erosion is the outstanding conservation requirement on Iowa's cropland with over 50 percent having this problem. Over 71 percent of the area on which erosion is the dominant problem is in need of treatment and feasible to treat.

Almost 11 percent of the cropland in Iowa is class I land with no problems that limit use.

The major treatment needed on pasture is the improvement and/or reestablishment of vegetative cover. Much of the pasture also needs some protection of vegetative cover from the hazard of overgrazing use, erosion, rodents, and encroachment of weeds.

Treatment needs on Iowa's woodlands involve establishment, reinforcement, and improvement of timber stands and protection against animals, insects, diseases, and fire.

Other land in the Iowa inventory includes mainly farmsteads and wildlife areas. Nearly two-thirds of this land needs protection against erosion and about one-fourth needs treatment to control excess water.

Another important part of the soil and water conservation program in the State revolves around the U.S. Department of Agriculture's upstream watershed protection and flood prevention activities (Public Law 566—1954), administered by the Soil Conservation Service.

Iowa divides naturally into 206 small watersheds that fit the watershed-size definition under Public Law 566. Of that number 201 watersheds need upstream watershed project action. And the people are acting. Applications from local sponsors in 57 of these watersheds have been approved through January 1, 1964, by the Iowa State Soil Conservation Committee, and planning is underway in 31 and 22 are in the operations stage.

In addition, the 4,500 square-mile Little Sioux flood prevention project, authorized by the 76th Congress (Public Law 534) and put into operation in 1946—with its many structures, diversions, dikes, grass waterways, terraces, etc.—serves as an example of what can be expected from conservation work in other watersheds. Its most recent test occurred in June 1963, when 11 inches of rain fell in 60 hours but no flood hurt the town of Anthon.

Another development during the past 2 years, involving only a small acreage so far but with a great potential as a way to conserve soil and water on Iowa land, is the shift of Iowa farmland to recreation. Vacation farms, picnic sites, golf courses, fishing and camping facilities, and hunting and shooting preserves are the sort of recreation attractions being provided. This trend will help, especially, in the conservation of rough or badly eroded land, and in preserving other land for future needs as cropland.

SOIL CONSERVATION PRACTICES

Soil and water conservation practices in Iowa as throughout the Nation are designed to fit the conservation needs farm by farm, county by county, area by area. Some practices can be carried out on an individual farm by its owner. Others require a group attack. When conservation problems are especially complex or costly, they are sometimes best corrected through a watershed project. Watershed projects are often used to meet a combination of farm and urban needs for such things as water supplies, water control, and recreational opportunities.

Conservation practices are used to supplement and support good cropping systems on individual farms. Practices are tied into the overall farm conservation plans. Without conservation land treatment, many individual practices would not be effective.

The most common on-farm practices used in Iowa can be divided into two kinds—vegetative practices and mechanical or structural practices.

The following are the principal vegetative practices, their description, and approximate

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

acreages or amounts that have been applied to date as part of Iowa district cooperators' soil and water conservation plans:

Stripcropping: The growing of field crops in approximately parallel strips to slow water runoff and increase soil absorption, also reducing erosion. In sloping fields, strips are laid out to fit the contour of the land. More than 343,000 acres are being stripcropped regularly.

Conservation cropping systems: Growing crops in an orderly sequence to provide erosion control, water conservation, and some measure of protection from weather and insect hazards along with economical production. The current total is about six and a half million acres.

Grassed waterways and outlets: Mechanically shaped channels seeded to grass and used as part of the water disposal system on the farm. Width, depth, and vegetation are designed for both water carrying capacity and control of erosion in the channel. There are 139,780 acres of such waterways.

Tree planting: The planting of trees, usually on steeper slopes, for erosion control and timber production. The current total is 14,800 acres.

Farmstead windbreaks: Enclosure of the farmstead area with trees and shrubs. More than 1,000 acres are thus enclosed.

Wildlife habitat developments: Improvements for wildlife to include food, shelter, water, nesting cover, and other desirable features in a designated area. There are now 65,000 acres so developed.

Pasture planting: Established long-term stands of pasture legumes and grasses on land converted to pasture or hayland from other uses. There are more than 20,000 acres.

Pasture renovation: Reestablishment of improved mixtures of grasses and legumes on existing hayland or pasture. This adds up to more than 300,000 acres.

The principal mechanical or structural practices in Iowa include:

Contour farming: Performing tillage and other regular field operations on the contour across the natural slope of the land. About 3,500,000 acres of Iowa cropland are being contoured when in grain crops.

Terraces: Constructed berms and channels in the approximate contour of the land used to slow water down and increase the insoak before conducting it safely from the land to a stable outlet. There are several types of terraces, but all of them have the effect of breaking long slopes into shorter ones. The increased use of parallel terraces has been one of the major recent conservation developments in Iowa. Parallel terraces went from 1,084,000 feet in 1962 to 1,752,400 feet in 1963. The total of all terraces established to date is 237,615,670. Terraces are a cropland practice.

Diversions: Similar to terraces, but designed to divert water off the land below. Size, grade, and use of grassed or ungrassed channel depends on the situation. Diversions are not limited to cropland. The present Iowa total is 18,440,000 feet.

Farm ponds: Constructed reservoirs for water impoundment. The number is 24,855.

Tile drains: Lines of field tile laid in the ground to remove excess water so that plants will grow better. The total to date is 876,105,700 feet.

Grade stabilization structures: Concrete, steel, and earthen installations of various types used at strategic or critical points to stabilize water runoff channels. More than 9,000 have been established.

Floodwater retarding structures: Concrete, steel, and earthen installations of various types used to impound water temporarily and release it at a measured rate. The number to date is 318.

NOTE.—Floodwater retarding structures are particularly useful in group watershed projects. Often structures are designed both for grade stabilization and floodwater detention. The Soil Conservation Service is now working with 62 community-type watershed groups in Iowa.

SABBATICAL LEAVE FOR FOREIGN SERVICE PERSONNEL

(Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last month I appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to propose a sabbatical leave program for Foreign Service officers. Today I have introduced a bill which would implement the proposal I made to the House Foreign Affairs Committee on May 4, 1964.

The legislation I have introduced would amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946 by permitting the Secretary of State to assign or detail officers or employees of the Foreign Service to educational institutions, trade, labor, agricultural, or other organizations.

I make this proposal because I feel strongly that there is a great need for more direct communication between the Foreign Service people and the American people at the grassroots concerning the objectives of our Government in the field of foreign affairs.

The sabbatical leave program that is envisaged in this bill would provide for a closer association between the people who represent our country on the foreign front and the people back home.

The strength of any nation's foreign policy lies in broad national understanding and support of that policy. I believe that if the legislation I introduce today is enacted, it will contribute immeasurably to a better understanding on the part of the American people of our involvement in foreign affairs.

But above and beyond the benefits to the American people, the Foreign Service personnel themselves would be helped immensely by a sabbatical leave program. By going out to the grassroots, these people would get a feel of what the American people are thinking by talking to PTA groups; to civic organizations such as the Lions Club, chamber of commerce, and others; and to farm organization meetings. After talking to these groups our Foreign Service people would be better prepared to represent this country on the foreign front.

I can envisage such personnel being assigned to a college in the first district such as Iowa Wesleyan or Parsons where they could teach some college courses according to their qualifications and where they could meet and talk to college students.

You will notice that my bill provides that institutions or organizations which utilize Foreign Service personnel in the manner described will help pay for the program through contribution to salary and travel expense. This would reduce the cost of the program.

The cost of the program will be worth every cent to the American people who will become better acquainted with our foreign affairs and to our Foreign Service officers who will be better prepared to represent us.

I sincerely hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House will give prompt and serious consideration to my bill.

CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leverett Chapin, associate editor of the Denver Post has carefully and incisively analyzed the question of congressional pay raises. His remarks are pertinent and timely, and I recommend his observations to my colleagues:

THIS IS FRUGALITY?

(By Leverett Chapin)

Since 1955, when Congress gave itself its last pay raise, the cost of living has gone up 15.4 percent so the House of Representatives thinks it would be nice to raise the pay of Congressmen and Senators 33.33 percent, to $30,000 a year, plus uncounted fringe benefits which Members don't like to talk about.

A proposal to that effect went sailing through the House on Thursday and if House Members, all of whom must face the electorate this fall, are willing to run the risk of looking grabby, there can be but little doubt that Senators, only one-third of whom are up for reelection this year, will follow suit.

President Johnson is credited with encouraging House Members who wanted more money, but were embarrassed to vote for such a gluttonous bite, to set aside their reluctance.

How the 33.33 percent pay raise will fit into the Johnson frugality-in-Government program, which was announced less than 2 months ago, has not been explained.

The time between congressional pay raises is becoming so short one is inclined to wonder whether House and Senate Members were listening when the late President Kennedy told us all, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

Congress once showed commendable restraint by not upping its own pay oftener than every 30 or 40 years. For example, when Congress in 1866 increased its pay to $5,000 per Member per year, with relatively few fringe benefits except for free snuff for Senators, that scale remained in effect for 41 years.

The increase voted in 1907, to $7,500, remained unchanged for 22 years. The $10,000 pay, voted in 1925, lasted for 20 years until, in 1945–46 the amount was boosted to $15,000.

The next increase, from $15,000 to $22,500, came in 1955 after only 9 years and now, 9 years later again, the new pay raise—to $30,000—is well along toward enactment.

The worst feature of this latest raise is that it contains a provision which will give increases almost automatically to Congressmen and Senators in the future.

This will be accomplished by tying congressional pay to upper bracket civil service pay. Whenever these civil servants get more money, and they are constantly lobbying for that purpose. House and Senate Members will get more pay, too.

As raises become more frequent under this system, Congress can take the self-righteous attitude that it had to give increases to civil servants to keep good men in government and the fact that it gave itself a raise at the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

same time was merely incidental, hardly worth noticing, really of no importance.

It is gratifying to know that two Colorado Congressmen J. EDGAR CHENOWETH and DON BROTZMAN, voted against the pay raise bill on Thursday. Representatives WAYNE ASPINALL and BYRON G. ROGERS presumably will have explanations of their votes in favor of the increase when they return to seek reelection.

WILL THE EDSEL FLY?

(Mr. BROCK (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, further study of the Pentagon's "public affairs plan" reveals an effort to feed the American public another one of Secretary McNamara's gross distortions of the TFX record.

A Pentagon memorandum of March 5, 1964—inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] on April 21, 1964—containing this news management scheme requires that in preparing information for release concerning the development of the TFX—F–111 tactical fighter—the Departments of the Air Force and Navy and their contractors adhere to the following guideline:

> The aircraft will be described in such a manner as to make it clear that the advanced fighter will meet the requirements of the Air Force's tactical air mission, the Navy's carrier-based fighter mission, and the fighter mission of the Marine Corps.

This directive refers to the "statement by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate" dated March 13, 1963. In light of the McClellan Investigations Committee hearings it becomes evident that this is an effort to perpetuate another one of the gross distortions that Secretary McNamara made of the original TFX award record. This specific distortion was an obvious attempt to mislead Congress and the public into believing that there was "little to choose between" the General Dynamics and Boeing TFX proposals and that both would fulfill military needs.

Secretary McNamara made the statement on March 13, 1963, to the McClellan Investigations Committee:

> The report itself did not express a preference for either proposal, and indicated there was little to choose between the proposals. Both proposals were certified by General LeMay and Admiral Anderson to meet military requirements (p. 375).
>
> * * * * *
>
> At the risk of repetition, I want to read to you again the general conclusions of the evaluation group which were restated verbatim by the Air Council, with concurrence of Admiral Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, and General LeMay, Chief of Staff of the Air Force:
>
> * * * * *
>
> The fourth evaluation report did not choose between the contractors. When I reviewed the report, I could see why. The question was a very close one (pp. 380, 381).

But McNamara failed to read to the committee the actual conclusions of the Air Force Council's report which were the recommendations for Boeing, page 1754. Nor did he read the important last paragraph which follows:

> (h) There is a clear and substantial advantage in the Boeing proposal over the General Dynamics proposal which is magnified by the environment found under the austere conditions usually inherent in limited war actions (p. 761).

He failed to read to the committee the actual recommendations of the Fourth Source Selection Board which states:

> 3. The Board unanimously recommend that X (Boeing) be selected as a source. Some considerations bearing on this decision are: (a) Superiority in all major aspects of operational capability, (b) lower quoted cost, (c) positive ground deceleration mechanism, (d) greater weapons selectivity and carrying ability, (e) less risk of foreign object damage and missile exhaust degradation of engine performance (p. 1164).

McNamara's distortion that both proposals would meet military requirements is based on the questionable assumption that the downgrade requirements which were met will be sufficient for future military needs, pages 723, 779, 780, 1393. The original Navy requirements were not met, page 328.

The Director of the Evaluation Division, Bureau of Naval Weapons, George Spangenberg, testified in reference to meeting Navy requirements that "Boeing comes closer to the original and to the revised and to all others," page 335. The then Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. George Anderson in explaining to the committee his reasons for recommending that the superior Boeing proposal be chosen stated that the downgrading of Navy requirements "magnified the import of small differences between the two designs in critical areas" and that "an edge of advantage is of greatest importance" in wartime, pages 78, 775. He further indicated that the weight and size of the TFX would restrict its use to the large carriers, page 779. Recent testimony before another congressional committee and George C. Wilson's recent article in Aviation Week indicate that the General Dynamics plans now may be too heavy for the Navy to use.

The American public is entitled to the truth behind the TFX affair. If we are going to spend $7 billion of the taxpayer's money to produce a "Flying Edsel," the American people have a right to know about it. In truth, we need to know, will the Edsel fly? Since Secretary McNamara's officialdom sees fit to give only half truth and distortion, I hope the McClellan committee will resume its investigations of the TFX contract award.

THE FUTURE OF EDUCATION

(Mr. DEROUNIAN (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert herewith for the edification of the House the commencement address of our colleague, the Honorable John W. Wydler, given at Nassau Community College on Thursday, June 11, 1964:

On May 15, 1960, the then Nassau County executive, A. Holly Patterson, dedicated Nassau Community College with a call for "academic excellence."

This week I celebrated my birthday. Since it was my 40th birthday, the word "celebrated" may be inappropriate, for I reached that magic number in life which is considered middle aged.

I mention this because it illustrates that Nassau Community College has also in these last 4 years passed through its infancy, and its youth—and truly come of age.

It has rallied to meet the challenge of Mr. Patterson and has attained "academic excellence."

I am proud to be the Congressman from the Fourth Congressional District of New York—and among the proudest possessions of our district is the faculty and student body of this Community College.

I am also particularly happy to be here this evening to share with you the rich experience of a graduation—because I missed so many of my own. Because of the war I left for college to attend an accelerated course at Brown University before my graduation ceremonies at high school. I left Brown after 2½ years to go to Harvard Law School, and so had no graduation ceremony from college. And I left Harvard Law School to attend a bar review course and could not attend my graduation ceremony there.

Tonight, at long last, I have the pleasure of finally going to a graduation ceremony. And I thank you all for it.

My message tonight will be short and direct. It concerns the Federal Government and the future of education. But more than that, it concerns the status of our American way of life in 1964.

. Nothing can reveal more about the way people live and think than the educational system they maintain.

The American system of higher education today offers educational opportunities to a larger fraction of the Nation's young people than any other system in the world. At its best it offers a quality of educational opportunity unsurpassed in the world. Our colleges and universities, through their teaching and research programs, have become the greatest intellectual, cultural, and economic assets of the Nation.

This last statement is not mine—it was adopted by the Association of American Universities in 1964—and this group is more noted for self-criticism than self-praise.

I fully support that statement. It means our administrators and faculty have been doing a good, sound job in offering higher educational opportunities to our young people. It means our young people have utilized them wisely. I congratulate you both.

This might be a good point to end my speech, but I must take a look at some ways to make our system better. That requires, first, that we ask the right questions, and second, that we get the right answers. These are equally hard to do.

Question. What is the Federal Government's role in higher education?

The answer is that it should make public funds available to help colleges provide higher educational needs insofar as it can do so without interfering in the legitimate aims of that education. This is not easy, and is a narrow line indeed. No Federal funds are given without some Federal controls. The nature and extent of these controls are always being balanced.

We did act in the last Congress to make available funds for the construction of needed buildings on U.S. college campuses. The Federal Government also has scholarship and student loan programs. These are well known and useful programs that have been an unqualified success.

There is one part of the Federal program that is little understood by the public in general. It is heading, in my opinion, toward

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

real trouble in the near future unless it is reexamined, explained and sold to the public.

These are the programs whereby the Federal Government is granting money to colleges to conduct research—specific and general—applied and basic.

As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee in the House of Representatives, I have seen these programs at work and I believe they must be examined right away by Congress to insure that they will not come into public disfavor and lose general acceptance.

I differentiate between the research programs conducted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which lets research contracts to achieve specific results in attaining the conquest of space. Public acceptance or rejection of these projects are part and parcel of our national space programs and objectives.

The other type of research is that conducted by the National Science Foundation—also under the purview of our committee, but, in reality, uncontrolled. This agency spends hundreds of millions of dollars each year for basic type research—much of it of a "way-out" variety.

For example, Federal funds have been granted as follows:

1. For an analysis of nest building in Weaverbirds, $20,000.

2. For an investigation of the mating calls of Central American bufo (toad frogs), $21,200.

3. For the study of respiratory mechanisms in cultivated mushrooms, $8,000.

4. To study the distribution of turtles in Central America, $23,400.

5. For a study of the social behavior in population dynamics of the marmot, $15,000.

These are extreme examples—but there are many more. If questioned, the agency merely explains that great results often flow from basic research. Many Congressmen shrugged it off, not having the scientific background to question the grants. And these are grants—not contracts. The giving of Federal funds is final and irrevocable.

What guarantee does the Government have that these grants are wise—with a reasonable chance of being fruitful? I know of none. I believe it is time to ask some questions and get some answers. I would like to know what results have been achieved by these programs to date. I would like to explore the possibility of making them joint projects with the sponsoring universities. I would be greatly reassured to know a university head was willing to invest at least some of his hard-earned and valuable funds to further the project. Cost sharing may be the best guarantee of responsibility.

I think it's time to have full-dress hearings on this matter—time to study and review it. Time to explore the possibilities of new guidelines and replacing grants with contracts that call for results. At the same time we should review administrative requirements and find ways to reduce paperwork and redtape imposed on colleges by these programs.

At a time when there are so many demands on our national treasure—we must guard it jealously.

And I'm saying this tonight because it concerns you graduates as future citizens who will be contributing your wealth to the national treasure.

Now, I have talked a great deal about asking questions and getting answers. This is something you will be doing the rest of your lives. You will find out there are a lot more questions than answers. But you will be living in an age when we have more answers, and the right answers, than ever before.

You already have a big start down the road to success. You were blessed by God with good minds and have had a chance to develop them at this college. The union of college graduates is constantly getting more and more pay for its members—and it a great union with no dues and lifelong membership.

Only last night I heard the Secretary of Labor state that graduates of community colleges had more job opportunities than graduates of 4-year colleges.

At this point in your lives it appears that everything is going your way. Just remember that your education is not something for nothing. Tonight you will receive your reward for past effort and excellence, but tomorrow and every day thereafter the price you pay for it will be your citizen responsibility. That lies immediately ahead.

You are the products and beneficiaries of the great university of the State of New York. By 1970, it is estimated that half of all freshmen in New York will be enrolled in community colleges. There are more growing pains ahead, and you will be part of the public on whom rests the responsibility for meeting them. The competition and proper relationships of 2- and 4-year colleges, as well as public and private colleges, raises questions to which all of us here tonight must help to find the answers.

In my opinion, the State of New York has one more major job to complete before it can be truly convinced that it has the best State university in the country. I'm talking about the establishment of the New York Institute of Technology—similar to MIT and Cal Tech but second to none of them. It would be geared specifically to the space sciences. Today, the existence of such competence is necessary for the proper development of business and industry. The creation of such a center is so important to our future development, not only in education but in the competition for business development, that I believe the priority for the project must be raised. The wheels should be made to turn this year, and I believe we should bring it to Long Island to back up and complement our industrial competence. This calls for a team effort, as there is no partisanship in progress.

In closing tonight, I will mention some of the "shock" addresses made by speakers at graduation ceremonies. The officials of Columbia University seem to have a special proclivity for this type of shock treatment.

Last December, Jacques Barzun, dean of faculties there, said "the liberal arts tradition is dead or dying." Of course, this was good for some anguished outcrys from educators across the land. The statement is credible only because there are those who question the value of anything that has no direct, practical application.

Not to be outdone, just this month Dr. Grayson Kirk, the president, stated flatly that "the American dream was over." He went on to conclude that "many of the cherished beliefs of our national youth no longer seem to fit the condition of life in our time."

Now I don't want to accuse Dr. Kirk of being an intellectual beatnik, but I think his slightly jaded attitude is dead wrong.

He never defined the "American dream," but to me it was—and is—the desire to live better—both materially and in freedom. It is particularly distinguished, moreover, by the spirit of adventure, the zest, the enthusiasm to do something about it. The American dream is philosophy in action—and it is not dead.

We have great challenges ahead. In space, we can roll back the mysteries of infinity. On earth, we can first unleash and then harness the power of the atom for the betterment of mankind. If automation is a threat it is also an exciting idea with possibilities for the better life. If the population explosion is a problem it is one that can be met by enthusiastic action proven still possible in America by all our dedicated Peace Corps men and women around the world.

I'm shocked at Dr. Kirk for so misinterpreting the cut of the American character. Unable to find ready answers to some questions—there are those who change the questions.

For example, for years our most pointed national question was "How could we win the struggle with communism?" This has proved a very difficult question, and recently I've heard the question changed to "How can we live in peace with communism?" We should not delude ourselves that by changing questions we have found answers.

Dr. Kirk now seems to want to change the question of "How can we make the American dream come true?" to "How can we dream in an atomic bomb age?"

I hope you will go on dreaming our national dream. We have realized much of it already. I also hope you will put that dream into action by a generous application of zest, enthusiasm, and the spirit of adventure. Ask the right questions and seek—eternally seek—the right answers.

A MANDATE TO INVESTIGATE (PART II)

(Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. MATHIAS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, there was discussion on the floor of the House Monday concerning the need for the House to act in order to clear up certain questions concerning this body.

It was suggested that, as a result of the Bobby Baker hearings before the Senate Rules Committee, certain information has become public knowledge which reflected upon the activities of a former official of the House of Representatives.

The question was raised whether the official, William N. McLeod, Jr., former chief clerk of the House District Committee, was ably serving this body in view of his associations with other interests in the District of Columbia.

Specifically, there were these areas which in the opinion of many need further investigation:

First. The payment of $1,500 to McLeod by Silver Spring insurance agent, Don B. Reynolds. This payment reportedly was for McLeod's help in obtaining authorization for the construction of the District of Columbia Stadium.

Second. The payment of $1,000 to Mr. McLeod by the Metropolitan Police Relief Association in appreciation of services he performed while an employee of this body.

Third. McLeod's association with the pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia.

Fourth. McLeod's association with liquor distributors in the District of Columbia.

Fifth. The reason for the retainer which was reportedly paid McLeod for some period of time by a South Carolina insurance company.

Sixth. The report that McLeod received an expensive color television set from a Washington gambling figure.

Questions were also raised concerning the activities of Mr. Nathaniel W. Barber, an official of Household Finance Corp. here in Washington, especially since McLeod now has offices in the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Commerce Commission; and Najeeb E. Halaby, Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, and Eugene G. Fubini, Deputy Director of Defense Research and Engineering, DOD, both on items for the FAA.

Hearings continue on Tuesday, June 30.

APPROPRIATIONS—LABOR-HEW

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on H.R. 10809, fiscal 1965 appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, receiving testimony from Senator Hart, on funds for the Midwest Water Pollution Control Laboratory, Ann Arbor, Mich.; and from several public witnesses, on various items in the bill.

Hearings continue on Tuesday, June 30, when other public witnesses will be heard.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported without amendment H.R. 10314, extending for 4 years three civil defense authorities which would otherwise expire on June 30, 1964; and with amendment H.R. 2664, exempting from induction a sole-surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service. Committee also approved the nominations of Solis Horwitz, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense; Daniel M. Luevano, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army; Dr. Robert Warren Morse, of Rhode Island, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy; Leonard Marks, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; and John T. McNaughton, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs; and 2,817 nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

Prior to this action, committee held hearings on H.R. 10314, with testimony from William P. Durkee, Director, Civil Defense, Department of the Army. Messrs. Horwitz, Luevano, and Marks, and Dr. Morse were present to testify and answer questions on their own behalf.

SOUTH VIETNAM

Committee on Armed Services: The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee met in executive session to receive testimony from Air Force officials relative to the situation in South Vietnam.

D.C. MATTERS

Committee on the District of Columbia: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported H.J. Res. 888, relating to the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1965, Inc.; H.R. 8313, providing for the conversion of D.C. credit unions into Federal credit unions; and H.R. 6413, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia.

Committee also approved the nomination of James A. Washington, Jr., to be a member of the D.C. Public Utilities Commission.

Prior to this action, hearings were held on the above-listed nomination, with testimony from Joseph Rauh and William D. Thompson, both D.C. attorneys; and Irving Schlaifer, a D.C. citizen. The nominee was present to testify and answer questions on his own behalf.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Finance: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported H.R. 6777, providing for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who are totally disabled before age 65; H.R. 6920, raising age limit to 65 for total disability income provision on national service life insurance policies; H.R. 2434, permitting payment of special pension to holders of Congressional Medal of Honor awarded this medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy (amended); H.R. 3941, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the VA for amounts paid by burial associations; and H.R. 6455, providing an exemption from the tax on unrelated business taxable income in case of labor unions and agricultural organizations where certain conditions are met.

FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee continued its executive consideration of H.R. 11380, fiscal 1965 authorizations for the foreign aid program, but did not conclude action thereon, and will meet again tomorrow.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Committee on Government Operations: Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations held executive hearings to hear Col. George A. Lincoln, professor of social sciences, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, testify with regard to current changes in the military profession.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

POVERTY

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Select Subcommittee on Poverty concluded its current series of hearings on S. 2642, providing for the mobilization of human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the U.S., after receiving testimony from Representative Frelinghuysen; and Dr. Grant Venn, superintendent of Wood County Schools, Parkersburg, W. Va.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' MEDICAL SERVICES

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Subcommittee on Federal Employees' Compensation held hearings on S. 1710 and S. 2078, permitting injured Federal employees to receive services from physicians and qualified chiropractors, receiving testimony from Senators Burdick and Magnuson, the latter of whom submitted a

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

statement; Grady V. Lake and Joseph P. Adams, both of the International Chiropractors Association; Paul Badger, an attorney of Washington, D.C.; James E. Bunker and Dr. Benjamin Goldstein, both of the American Chiropractic Association; Dewey Anderson, Public Affairs Institute; Jerome J. Keating, National Association of Letter Carriers; and John O'Connor, United Federation of Postal Clerks. Several written statements were submitted for inclusion in the record.

Hearings were adjourned subject to call.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' PAY

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported with amendments H.R. 11049, Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964, after which it issued the following statement:

The committee raised the increases in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 to an even 3 percent. The House provision for increasing the compensation of postmasters at fourth-class offices was modified to reduce costs while at the same time granting liberal increases. Annual step increases for the first seven steps have been extended to all levels of the Postal Field Service.

The salary increase for Members of Congress as provided in the House bill was adopted. The committee amended the executive salary schedule to provide for five levels of executive compensation. The offices and positions in all five levels are specified in the bill as amended by the Senate committee. The rates for the five levels are: $35,000; $30,000; $28,500; $27,000; and $26,000.

In addition, the President has been given the authority to place 20 other officers at either level 4 or level 5.

The House provisions for judicial salary increases were approved with minor changes, not affecting Federal judges. The committee deleted title 5, the Udall amendment, from the Senate version of the bill. The effective date of the bill has been set for July 1, 1964.

The committee amended the House bill to provide for increases in the allowances for the staffs of former Presidents of the United States.

AIR POLLUTION

Committee on Public Works: Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution continued its hearings to obtain supplemental information relative to abatement of air pollution, receiving testimony from R. E. Sutherland, Universal Oil Products Co.; F. E. Ivey, W. R. Grace & Co.; James B. Smith, American Cyanamid; and E. C. Lentz, Walker Manufacturing Co.

Hearings continue on Tuesday, June 30.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 72 public bills, H.R. 11741–11812; 5 private bills, H.R. 11813–11817; and 24 resolutions, H.J. Res. 1056–1077, and H. Res. 791 and 792, were introduced. Pages 14460, 14553–14555

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 7073, to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under such act (H. Rept. 1517); and

H.R. 11812, making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for fiscal year 1965 (H. Rept. 1518). Page 14553

NASA Authorization: The House disagreed to Senate amendments to H.R. 10456, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; agreed to a conference requested by the Senate; and appointed as conferees Representatives Miller of California, Teague of Texas, Karth, Hechler, Martin of Massachusetts, Fulton of Pennsylvania, and Chenoweth. Page 14457

Fisheries: Passed, by a voice vote, H.R. 6007, to permit the vessel *SC–1473* to engage in the fisheries. Page 14457

Interior Appropriations: House disagreed to Senate amendments to H.R. 10433, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1965; agreed to a conference requested by the Senate; and appointed as conferees Representatives Kirwan, Denton, Mahon, Harrison, and Reifel. Page 14458

Grand Prairie, Tex.—Airport: H.R. 8462, relating to transfer of land and development of adequate airport facilities at Grand Prairie, Tex., was cleared for Presidential action by House agreement to Senate amendments thereto. Pages 14458–14460

Continuing Appropriations: By a voice vote the House adopted H.J. Res. 1056, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1965 through August 31. The resolution provides funds for continuing those functions of the Government for which annual appropriation bills will not have been enacted prior to July 1. Pages 14460–14462

Mass Transit: By a record vote of 212 yeas to 189 nays the House passed H.R. 3881, to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, after adopting a committee substitute amendment that provided new text for the bill.

Rejected, by a record vote of 190 yeas to 215 nays, a recommittal motion designed to defer action on the legislation pending conclusion and evaluation of certain engineering studies and plans.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

who in many instances are burdened with heavy expenses, or losses incurred in moving from land which was acquired by the Federal Government, for which under existing law they do not now receive adequate compensation.

A special subcommittee was appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, on February 18, 1964, consisting of myself as chairman and Senators McINTYRE, RIBICOFF, MILLER, and PEARSON, to consider S. 1509, S. 1232, and H.R. 6237, bills introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services, as part of the GSA legislative program for 1964.

This bill provides that reimbursement shall be in addition to, but not in duplication of, other payments authorized by law. The total reimbursement for moving household effects, business establishments, livestock and farm equipment, or other possessions shall not exceed 25 percent of the fair market value of the property as determined by the head of the agency. Such moving expenses, losses or damages directly resulting from moving to a new location must be supported by an itemized statement submitted to the head of the agency concerned within 1 year from (a) the date the interest is to be vacated under an agreement with the Government, or (b) the date the parcel is actually vacated, whichever first occurs.

As set forth in the report on S. 1509, representatives of the GSA assured the committee that the 25-percent limitation placed on this bill was a ceiling only, and that this provision is identical to the provisions of existing law under which the Departments of Defense and Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have been operating for several years.

Similar legislation was reported by the committee in the 86th Congress and the committee gave further extended consideration to a similar proposal in the 87th Congress. The committee has been assured that the proposed legislation is desirable and in the public interest since it will permit the establishment of a uniform Governmentwide policy for the payment of actual expenses and losses incurred, within the limits prescribed, by individuals who are forced to vacate their homes or from land acquired by the Government regardless of the agency involved in the negotiations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, and the bill be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2959. A bill for the relief of Maj. Robert G. Smith, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. McGOVERN):

S. 2960. A bill providing for the formulation of an effective program for fulfilling our military manpower requirements on a voluntary basis in order that mandatory service in the Armed Forces may be terminated not later than June 30, 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AN ADDENDUM AS PART 2 OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 69, 88TH CONGRESS, ON "WORLD COMMUNISM—A SELECTED ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY"

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 336); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as part 2 of Senate Document No. 69, 88th Congress, entitled "World Communism—A Selected Annotated Bibliography," an addendum to that document prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, at the request of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary; and that there be printed five thousand three hundred (5,300) additional copies of part 2 of such document for the use of that committee.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND ENUMERATION OF CERTAIN PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 337) relative to disclosure of financial interests and definition of prohibited activities of Senate personnel, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1079)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1080)

Mr. GRUENING submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2881) to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964, and subsequent seismic waves, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. GRUENING, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Address entitled "Residual Fuel Oil Imports: A Consumer's Eye View," delivered by Charles W. Colson, counsel for the New England Council, to the Rocky Mountain Petroleum Institute, at Boulder, Colo., on June 18, 1964, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Article entitled "Civil Defense Station in Texas Houses Nuclear Attack Center for Arkansas," by Preston McGraw, of United Press International, describing some of the outstanding work of the Civil Defense Director Bill Parker, of region 5 of the Office of Civil Defense, in the Denton, Tex., Federal Center.

By Mr. MORTON:

Letter from Richard J. Henchey, Jr., of Louisville, Ky., commending Representative GENE SNYDER, of Kentucky, for helping reduce Government expenditures.

CALIFORNIA INTERTIE AND LIBBY DAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the recent announcement of the plan for the California intertie by the Department of the Interior will help implement the Canadian treaty, and therefore will help assure early construction of Libby Dam, in northwestern Montana. My colleague, Senator LEE METCALF and I are hopeful that construction on this project can be started in the very near future.

Secretary of the Interior Udall recommended construction of four big electrical interconnections to sell surplus Northwest kilowatts in California, Arizona, and Nevada, and to exchange off-peak power between the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Southwest. Part of the plan calls for sale in California of Canadian treaty power which otherwise would be surplus to the Northwest for the first 5 to 10 years.

Canada has agreed to ratify the Columbia River treaty only if Canada's share of treaty power can be sold in the United States for 30 years for a lump sum of $254.4 million paid in advance by October 1, 1964. Libby Dam, which backs water 42 miles into Canada, can be built only if the treaty is approved by Canada.

A nonprofit corporation is now being formed by Northwest private and public utilities to buy Canada's share, sell revenue bonds to finance the prepayment to Canada, and resell Canada's share to produce revenues with which to repay the revenue bonds.

One of the more difficult problems of completing these arrangements is the fact that much of Canada's share of treaty power—which is more costly than the average cost of Bonneville Power

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Administration power—would be surplus to the needs of the Pacific Northwest for at least the first 5 years after treaty power comes on the line.

California utilities, public and private, however, have made firm offers to purchase at the established price large quantities of Canada's share of treaty power in these early years, and longer, if intertie facilities are built so treaty power can be transmitted outside the Northwest.

Assurance of a California market for surplus treaty power would greatly facilitate the completion of arrangements to prepay Canada for its share of treaty power and to hasten the day when Libby Dam is built.

Senator METCALF and I feel that the proposed intertie also would help Montana's industrial development and economic growth by helping keep the price of BPA power low. BPA expects to increase its net revenues by an average of $11 or $12 million per year for 50 years as a result of the intertie, and without intertie revenues would have to increase rates by that much more than with the intertie. I understand that total benefits to the Northwest resulting from the intertie are estimated at $1 billion over the next 50 years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to both Senators from Montana that we have got to find a way to work out the intertie arrangement, because I believe Canada has been exceedingly reasonable and fair in her negotiations with the United States in connection with the use of Columbia River water.

The real problem, however, is the question whether public preference customers will be protected in any intertie arrangement. I am going to do everything I can to cooperate in working out an intertie agreement; but the problem which confronts us in this whole intertie situation is whether, at the time when we approve an intertie, we shall have some idea as to what we are going to agree subsequently, when it comes to making wheeling contracts with the private utilities. Unfortunately, the private utilities do not have a very good record in regard to putting the public interest first.

I shall speak on this subject at some length before the adjournment of Congress. It bears upon the speech I made at St. Petersburg, Fla., some weeks ago, on the whole problem of public power preference protection, and the desirability of having the private utilities and the public projects work together on a cooperative basis.

As both the Senators from Montana know, in my 20 years in the Senate, I have been a strong advocate of the pooling arrangement; and I can see a wheeling arrangement as part of a pooling arrangement. But we are confronted with a legislative problem when we sanction an intertie arrangement, and leave for future negotiation with the private utilities the working out of the agreements in regard to the wheeling of the power.

Let me say to the Secretary of the Interior that I shall scrutinize any intertie proposal from this standpoint: What assurance shall we have that the private utilities will give us fair agreements for the wheeling, over their transmission lines, of the power that is generated at dams owned by the American people?

Once again I point out that if we let the private utilities control the transmission of the power, we turn the dams over to them, and we might just as well give them power at the bus bar. But I shall never support that, because it is not in the public interest.

If the private utilities wish to come forward with an intertie agreement—and among the private utilities I think there are some industrial statesmen who would like to change the pattern of the conduct of the private utilities in years gone by—I am willing to work with them; but I do believe that we should get this matter settled before we approve an intertie agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I sincerely hope the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States will see to it that the public interest is protected in this respect, before we enter into an intertie arrangement, and then leave to future negotiation chance the arrangement in regard to wheeling the power; because if the public preference groups cannot get the power on a fair-deal basis, we shall have cheated them; and I do not propose to be a party to cheating.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, of course I join my senior colleague in congratulating the Secretary of the Interior for arriving at this agreement, so that we can go forward with the construction of Libby Dam and the dams in Canada, and can carry out our agreement with Canada to market the power that is generated in the Northwest region.

I absolutely agree with the Senator from Oregon. In the Northwest, we have had a happy arrangement with the Northwest power pool and the Bonneville Power Administration. Private power, municipal power, and Federal public power have been working together in marketing their power and working for the benefit of the region to bring the power rates down, and thereby to bring new industries into the region.

I see no reason why the same program cannot continue in connection with the generation and transmission of power. If the power generated at publicly owned dams or through cooperative regional management is to move over transmission lines owned by private utilities, the result is the same, as has been said, as if the private utilities owned the power at the bus bar. To this, I am unalterably opposed.

But if we can work out an arrangement whereby the Federal Government owns the power, and, under long-term contracts, whereby the wheeling and the transmission lines are pooled, we can enjoy the same happy relationship that has been worked out in the Pacific Northwest, so that the private utility statesmen—and, as has been said, there are some—will, in cooperation with Federal public power and municipal power—such as that at the city of Los Angeles, aid in the pooling of these vast resources for the benefit of the people of America and for the benefit of their separate regions.

It will be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior to carefully scrutinize these contracts, to be sure the Bonneville Power Administration and the Northwest power policy, and the public interest are adequately protected. It goes without saying that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the other private power companies will also carefully scrutinize the contracts, to see that their interests are protected.

The present fine program in the Northwest—a program worked out with the aid of private utility statesmen—should be a pattern for similar programs in other regions of the country, so that, through cooperation between the various power sources, the highest development of the resources of the region can be achieved.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my recollection is that the specific proposal made my the Secretary of the Interior for an intertie has only recently been sent to Congress, and thus only recently been susceptible to public information and scrutiny.

Speaking for myself, I am quite unaware of its contents, other than in a rather general or nebulous way. Those who are at all acquainted with the proposal in California have both warmly endorsed and bitterly condemned the intertie proposal of the Secretary. I have said earlier, to the people of California, and I repeat now to the Senate, that Congress has a duty fully, carefully, and completely to scrutinize the proposal and then to determine where the public interest lies. That is what I propose to have done.

As I understand the mechanics of the process, the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior will come before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate this week. It may likewise come before the Appropriations Committee of the House.

I venture to suggest that there may very well be a sufficiently serious policy question involved to require the Interior Committees of the House and the Senate likewise to participate in the hearings, and to scrutinize the proposal which has been made.

Mr. President, it appears to me that the public interest would best be served by having hearings before both committees in each House, rather than merely before the Appropriations Committees in the two Houses.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DIRKSEN FOR HIS CONTRIBUTION TO THE PASSAGE OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Senator DIRKSEN's contribution to the passage of the civil rights bill is well known, but less well known is the reasoning and deep conviction which motivated his efforts. An editorial entitled "The Saga of Senator DIRKSEN," published in the Christian Science Monitor, on June 24,

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

JOURNAL

OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Monday - 29 June 1964

25X1 1. [redacted] Met with Mr. William Gulledge, Staff Director, Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, concerning the retroactive effect of the 1 July date in the pay increase legislation. Mr. Gulledge indicated that after reflection over the weekend he agrees that it will be necessary for the Committee to take an amendment on the floor of the Senate to insert the appropriate language to allow retroactive application of the pay increase by those agencies which have administrative authority to establish pay levels.

Later in the day I talked to Mr. Charles Johnson, Staff Director, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, who advised that if the attempted amendment on the floor of the Senate which I had discussed earlier in the day with Mr. Gulledge did not prove feasible for any reason he will raise the question in conference from the House side to provide insertion of the necessary language in conference. I thanked Mr. Johnson as I had earlier thanked Mr. Gulledge for his consideration and advised that we would forward a letter to the Chairman of the House Committee requesting action in conference should the amendment fail on the floor of the Senate.

25X1 2. [redacted] Met with Mr. Samuel J. Archibald, Moss Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, who reaffirmed that he will keep this office advised as the report is written. It appears at present that the report will be extremely critical of the use of the polygraph as an instrument that has not been established from scientific study and has not had statistical validation of its use. Mr. Archibald further indicated that we will receive a copy of the report for review prior to its transmission to the parent Committee.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

REPORT ON CERTAIN ASSISTANCE UNDER PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act to areas no longer burdened by substantial unemployment, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON INEFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION AND CONTROL OF TRAVEL ADVANCES AND PURCHASE OF TRANSPORTATION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on ineffective administration and control of travel advances and purchase of transportation, Department of Labor, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COSTS TO THE GOVERNMENT THROUGH THE LEASING OF CERTAIN ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING SYSTEMS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by the operating contractor, Aro, Inc., Arnold Engineering Development Center, Arnold Air Force Station, Tenn., Department of the Air Force, dated June 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON NEGOTIATIONS IN APPRAISAL OF LANDS ON THE THIRD DIVISION OF THE RIVERTON PROJECT, WYOMING

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on negotiations in the appraisal of lands on the third division of the Riverton project, Wyoming (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN GEORGIA, KANSAS, MAINE, AND OHIO

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on the Hiawassee River, Georgia, Muddy Creek, Kansas, Presque Isle Stream, Maine, and West Fork Duck Creek, Ohio (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

H.R. 11049. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1121).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1186. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands (Rept. No. 1122).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 2434. An act to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with with an enemy, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1123).

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 334); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-eighth Congress, $5,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 2953. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chong Hyok Un; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2954. A bill for the relief of Jordan V. Peyev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 2955. A bill to amend section 4216 (relating to the definition of price) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCARTHY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 2956. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the district of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2957. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Joseph C. Sandberg and Anna Marie Sandberg; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2958. A bill to conserve the human and natural resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. NELSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 334) providing additional funds for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. HILL, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES A REPORT ENTITLED "MINERALS AND WATER RESOURCES IN NEVADA"

Mr. CANNON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 335); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the report entitled "Mineral and Water Resources in Nevada", prepared by the United States Geological Survey and the Nevada Bureau of Mines, shall be printed as a Senate document. There shall be printed 5,000 additional copies of such Senate document which shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of Nevada.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4126 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill dealing with the amendment of section 4216 of the Internal Revenue Code. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanation of the purpose of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2955) to amend section 4216 (relating to the definition of price) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, introduced by Mr. MCCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4216(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the determination of "constructive sale price") is amended to read as follows:

"(b) CONSTRUCTIVE SALE PRICE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—If an article is—

"(A) sold at retail,

"(B) sold on consignment, or

"(C) sold (otherwise than through an arm's length transaction) at less than the fair market price,

the tax under this chapter shall (if based on the price for which the article is sold) be computed on the price for which such articles are sold, in the ordinary course of trade, by manufacturers or producers thereof, as determined by the Secretary or his delegate. In the case of an article sold at retail, the computation under the preceding sentence shall be on whichever of the following prices is the lower: (i) the price for which such article is sold, or (ii) the lowest price for which such articles are sold to wholesale distributors, in the ordinary course of trade, by manufacturers or producers thereof, as determined by the Secretary or his delegate. This paragraph shall not apply if paragraph (2) applies.

"(2) SPECIAL RULE.—If an article is sold at retail, to a retailer, or to a special dealer (as defined in paragraph (3)), and if—

"(A) the manufacturer, producer, or importer of such article regularly sells such articles at retail, to retailers, or to special dealers, as the case may be,

"(B) the manufacturer, producer, or importer of such article sells such articles to one or more wholesale distributors (other than special dealers) in arm's length transactions and he establishes that his prices in such cases are determined without regard to any tax benefit under this paragraph,

"(C) in the case of articles upon which tax is imposed under section 4061(a) (relating to automobiles, trucks, etc.), 4191 (relating to business machines), or 4211 (relating to matches), the normal method of sales for

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

such articles within the industry is not to sell such articles at retail or to retailers, or combinations, thereof, and

"(D) the transaction is an arm's length transaction, the tax under this chapter shall (if based on the price for which the article is sold) be computed on whichever of the following prices is the lower: (i) the price for which such article is sold, or (ii) the lowest price for such articles are sold by such manufacturer, producer, or importer to wholesale distributors (other than special dealers).

"(3) SPECIAL DEALER.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the term "special dealer" means a distributor of articles taxable under section 4121 who does not maintain a sales force to resell the article whose constructive price is established under paragraph (2) but relies on salesmen of the manufacturer, producer, or importer of the article for resale of the article to retailers."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The explanation presented by Mr. MCCARTHY is as follows:

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4216(b) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to further the congressional objective of equalizing the excise tax imposed upon similar articles sold at different levels of distribution by competing manufacturers so as to equalize the tax burden of the ultimate consumer regardless of the mode of distribution.

The manufacturers excise tax is imposed upon the manufacture and sale of certain articles named in chapter 32 of the code. Where sales are made by the manufacturer in what is considered the normal method of distribution—that is, sales to independent wholesale distributors—the tax, in most cases, is imposed upon the price for which articles are sold. However, there are instances in which it is necessary to construct a price because the sale is made outside the normal method of distribution; for example, sales to retailers, sales at retail to the ultimate consumer, and sales at less than fair market value to a wholly owned selling subsidiary of the manufacturer. For that matter, the tax is also imposed where the manufacturer uses the article rather than selling it. In this case also, of course, it is necessary to construct a price since no price has actually been paid.

This equalization would be accomplished in the case of sales made by a manufacturer directly to retailers or to consumers by providing for a constructive sale price that is comparable to the constructive sale price used by a manufacturer in the case of sales made to a wholly owned sales subsidiary. This constructive price would also be comparable to the tax base used by the manufacturer where a taxable use is made of the article.

The manufacturer's lowest price to independent wholesale distributors has historically been the base used as a constructive price in the case of the tax imposed upon the use of an article by the manufacturer, himself, and, also, in the case of sales by the manufacturer to a wholly owned selling subsidiary. This amendment would accord the same treatment to the manufacturer who sells to retailers or at retail to the ultimate consumer.

It has no purpose other than to achieve this obviously desired goal of uniformity and equality of treatment.

HUMAN AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION ACT OF 1964

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to conserve the human and natural resources of the Nation. Today America faces twin crises: through sheer failure to act we are wasting irreplaceable natural resources at an ever-increasing rate; at the same time there are millions of men who want to work but who cannot find jobs who are wasting their lives in poverty.

I propose we face both crises boldly and that we begin a substantial program to put men to work to conserve our natural resources. Such a program will at the same time conserve the human resources of the Nation.

America must begin at once to make a massive investment at the local, State and national level to save our natural resources from destruction. If we fail to act in the few years we have left, we could destroy not only the resources which provide much of the beauty and recreation in our life but our most important, lifegiving resources as well—the water we drink and the air we breathe.

Much of our priceless heritage is already lost. The 200 billion board feet of pine in northern Wisconsin, which could have made this area rich forever, is gone, and heartbreak and financial problems have lingered ever since. A substantial percentage of the rivers of the east are also hopelessly polluted, and the dull gray tide of pollution is slowly spreading over the surface waters of America.

The coastlines of America, the greatest recreational and scenic resource that America has, have been largely ruined by the most vulgar types of commercial exploitation or walled off on private ownership that allows public access to only 2 percent of the coastlines. Much of the true wilderness—our last real link with the world which God created—has been destroyed.

Many of our most beautiful highways have become ugly slums of garish signs and shoddy development.

These resources—gone and never to be replaced—were lost because our optimistic young country believed in what Secretary of the Interior Udall has called "the myth of superabundance." It shocked America to learn that it could run out of timber and land and minerals and scenic vistas and a lot of other things.

Today we face a genuine crisis. To retreat any further threatens America with the kind of resource destruction which turned a green forest into the Sahara Desert, and which made it virtually impossible for China and India to sustain the lives of all their citizens.

Look at some of the chilling facts:

First. Our population is expected to double by the year 2000—which is only 36 years away.

Second. We are presently using water at the rate of 355 billion gallons a day, and encountering serious water shortages in many parts of the Nation. By 1980, experts tell us we will need 600 billion gallons a day—almost twice our present water supply in a scant 17 years. And by the year 2000 we will need almost 900 billion gallons. Meanwhile, the relentless spread of pollution makes more and more water unsuitable for use each day.

Third. Automobiles are creating a nationwide traffic jam which is blighting the landscape of America and chewing up much of the valuable land—land which can never again be used for farms or forests or parks or homesites. The American Automobile Association estimates that our present 68 million passenger cars will increase to 95 million by 1976.

Fourth. The increase in population, in the number of cars and in leisure time is causing a geometric increase in demand on all parks and recreational space. Yet we are making no comparable increase in the amount of space available.

Fifth. Resources for the Future, an outstanding research organization, estimates that there will be 10 times the demand for outdoor recreation in the year 2000 that there was in 1950. The bipartisan report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission estimates that at the very least the overall demand for outdoor recreation will treble.

Sixth. Marion Clawson, the expert who made the study for Resources for the Future, estimates that the present 750,000 acres of city and county parks should be doubled right now, just to meet present demand. By the year 2000, we will need 5 million acres, Clawson estimates. The greatest demand of all—for a major increase in national park lands—simply cannot be met because there is no longer that much additional outstanding land available. The result will simply be more overcrowding—and the more unique, the more desirable an area it is, the more it will be crowded and overused.

The conservation crisis can be briefly summarized: our natural heritage of water, timber, and outdoor recreation space is disappearing. It is disappearing at the Federal, State, municipal, county, and private level.

Even as we begin to realize the dimensions of this crisis at all levels of endeavor, we are becoming more and more aware of the crisis of poverty in America. The President has shown that at least a fifth of our Nation lives in unacceptable conditions:

First. During 1962 there were 9.3 million families—or 35 million individuals—with family incomes of less than $3,000.

Second. Three million six hundred thousand of these families were headed by individuals who did not work at any time during the year.

Third. Of the remaining 5.7 million families, the heads of 1.5 million worked at part-time jobs only and 1.8 million work at full-time jobs for less than 50 weeks.

Fourth. Only 2.4 million of the family heads of these families worked full time. There were 6 million people in families with income below $3,000 who were dependent on family heads unemployed for 5 weeks or more.

These are some dimensions of the poverty crisis. Many members of these families are either too ill or too old to work. But many are not; unemployment or underemployment is a most unnecessary and unacceptable facet of American poverty. There is work to do in this country. Nevertheless, we find men without jobs throughout the Nation.

Unemployment is particularly severe in some regions of the country. In Ap-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1078)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDMUND PORT TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the hearing scheduled for Monday, June 29, 1964, on the nomination of Edmund Port, of New York, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of New York, vice Stephen W. Brennan, retired, has been rescheduled for Tuesday, June 30, 1964, at 10 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

Statement by him on the Basque people of Idaho.

By Mr. BOGGS:

Article entitled "Pierre S. Dupont High School, Wilmington, Del., Wins National Bellamy Award," by Mrs. Mina P. Thompson, published in the monthly news bulletin of the Wilmington public schools.

By Mr. PROUTY:

Article on need to expand small business to counteract increasing unemployment, written by C. Wilson Harder, and published in the June 18, 1964, issue of Roll Call.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

News release by Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on unveiling of statue of Taras Shevchenko.

SENATOR McCLELLAN'S ADDRESS AT DEDICATION OF NEW CHANCERY OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN MEXICO CITY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to have been a member of the small delegation for the dedication of our newly completed Chancery of the United States of America in Mexico City. The dedication was held on Saturday, June 20, and the principal speaker for the occasion was the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN. Since Senator MCCLELLAN is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of State, it was most appropriate for him to dedicate this building. Other distinguished Members of the Senate comprising the delegation were Senators E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, and B. EVERETT JORDAN, of North Carolina.

I am happy to report that this new chancery is a most impressive building and has been widely accepted by the Mexican people as well as by those Americans who have had the opportunity to see it. It is a permanent symbol of the affection between the United States of America and our host neighbors to the south, the United Mexican States.

I should like to insert in its entirety in the RECORD the brief speech delivered by Senator MCCLELLAN. I should also like to express my own appreciation and that of the Congress to those who gave of their energy and technical ability to plan and construct this building.

I refer particularly to Southwestern Architects-Engineers, of Texas, headed by Mr. Max Brooks and Mr. L. W. Pitts, and to the Constructora Marhnos, headed by Messrs. Nicholas and Mariano Mariscal, who were prime contractors for the building. Included also are the artisans and all the workers who made erection of this building possible. Ambassador Fulton A. Freeman and his entire Embassy staff of Americans and Mexicans are to be congratulated for the energy and devotion they displayed to make the dedication ceremony a great success. Similar mention should be made of the other members of the delegation, including Messrs. Merrick and Gonzalez of our own staff, and the official State Department delegation headed by Assistant Secretary Dwight J. Porter and Deputy Assistant Secretaries James R. Johnstone and Verne B. Lewis, who accompanied Senator MCCLELLAN and the other Senators and who contributed toward the success of the official opening of the American chancery.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR JOHN L. MCCLELLAN AT THE DEDICATION OF THE CHANCERY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, MEXICO CITY, JUNE 20, 1964

Mr. Master of Ceremonies, my first visit to Mexico was some 2½ years ago. That visit proved to be most instructive and beneficial in gaining a better understanding of the Mexican Government and the aspirations of the Mexican people. It was a real joy and privilege to be here then, and I am highly pleased and happy to be here again today.

It is a great pleasure, indeed, to welcome you to this ceremony. We are honored to have you present at the dedication of this, our new American Embassy. With keen anticipation and intense satisfaction, we have long looked forward to this most delightful and gratifying occasion.

Citizens of the United States and Mexico, working together, have constructed this building. Together they have made engineering history. We are all mindful of the challenge that Mexico City presents to architects and engineers. The foundation of this building rests on mud and water, 30 feet deep, but it is as secure as Torre Latinoamericana, which, as you know, has weathered earthquakes since it was built without losing so much as a windowpane.

We are proud of this building, proud of its marble-faced beauty which reflects the grandeur of this city, proud of its design which so artfully blends Mexican and North American cultures, and proud that it represents the achievements of Mexico, achievements as old as the pyramid of Cuicuilco, not far from here, and as new as the modern progress that is present all about us.

This is a pride that we of the United States share with you. It was only with the help of Mexicans that this Embassy now stands, or I might more aptly say floats, on the subsoil of Mexico City. The foundation for the building was ingeniously devised by Dr. Leonardo Zeevaert, as you well know, an outstanding Mexican structural engineer. It was Dr. Zeevaert who adapted the splendid architectural plans of Max Brooks and Skeets Pitts, associates of the Southwest Architects & Engineers firm of Houston, Tex., to the subsoil and seismic conditions of Mexico City.

The joint ingenuity of Mexicans and Americans met this challenge. There were setbacks, but the work went on, and the task was finished. I am sure the Constructora Marhnos of Mexico City must be proud of its accomplishment.

Let us draw inspiration today, then, not from the grandeur of this building alone, but from the fact that it was built here despite the natural obstacles that stood in the way. Let us draw inspiration from the fact that here a challenge was boldly met, so that we can turn our eyes to the greater challenges that face us in this hemisphere and which are being met by the Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress. Let us continue to meet these challenges with the same spirit, determination, and mutual cooperation that made the construction of this Embassy possible.

Let this Embassy, therefore, be dedicated to the true spirit of the Alliance for Progress, for we must remember that the Alliance for Progress will be successful only if it is kept a venture of lasting partnership. Mexico and the United States have long demonstrated that we can be partners in progress. We have long demonstrated how countries should work and live together in peace.

The resources of the United States can provide help, perhaps that margin of help which will make the difference between success and failure. But the United States, itself, cannot do the whole job, nor even the major part of it. Progress is and must be of mutual concern; it must be a joint effort, just as was the construction of this building.

Mexico has already shown the way for our sister republics in this great hemisphere. As President Kennedy recognized in the joint communique issued at the end of his visit to Mexico in 1962—"the fundamental goal of the Mexican Revolution is the same as that of the Alliance for Progress—social justice and economic progress within the framework of individual freedom and political liberty."

You have shown what a country can do when it really sets its mind to the task of raising the standards of living of its people.

You have opened the doors of your universities to hundreds of Latin Americans who seek to learn new techniques and to perfect old ones. In addition, our two countries have developed a joint program in which the United States provided transportation and Mexico the training for some 300 Latin Americans last year under the Alliance for Progress. Our universities are working with yours in research and study programs which are of mutual benefit.

Today, education is the largest single item in your budget. Surely you have set an example for all in this hemisphere to follow by adding a new schoolroom every 2 hours in your continuing campaign to wipe out illiteracy.

Your gross national product has increased almost five times since 1930. Your per capita

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

income has more than doubled. You have distributed over 100 million acres of land.

Your research in basic food crops has not only materially increased your own production but has helped to provide a better life for people in other countries. Your Government is making a continuing effort to achieve a technological revolution in agriculture. It has provided not only land but also credit, technical knowledge, and other needed assistance to the farmer.

Last year Mexico modified its banking laws and took other steps to launch a major attack on housing problems. Mexico requested the Inter-American Bank and the Agency for International Development to cooperate under the Alliance for Progress. We joined forces in a program that will cost almost a billion pesos. With this program, Mexico should, in a few years, reduce its housing shortage to manageable proportions.

You have achieved what our Secretary of State has called the "miracle of Mexico," and it gives us, and it should give all Latin America, confidence that the goals of the Alliance for Progress are attainable if each member country will only meet its commitments and responsibilities.

There are many reasons for your success, and there is much that other members of the Alliance for Progress can learn from Mexico's experience.

Mexico has set its own national objectives and sought to achieve them with its own resources. Your efforts have shown that if the Alliance is to be a success, each country must carry the heaviest part of its own burden.

One of the chief criticisms of the Alliance for Progress is that some Latin American countries have not fully accepted the responsibility for their own economic and social welfare. Instead, they have relied too heavily on others to provide the resources that create the essential conditions for development. This criticism, however, cannot be directed to Mexico.

Mexico has already proved its self-confidence and determination. But, undoubtedly, much remains to be done. You in Mexico realize this, and so do we, as we endeavor to face up to our own problems in the United States.

As President Johnson said in Los Angeles, Calif., a few months ago, "So long as there remains a man without a job, a family without a roof, a child without a school, we have much to do. Our permanent revolution is dedicated to broadening for all Americans, the material and the spiritual benefits of the democratic heritage."

Democratic institutions should be strengthened, private enterprise should be fostered and allowed to operate without undue and unnecessary restrictions. Educational systems must be further developed and expanded.

The spirit of friendship and cooperation that unites our peoples makes it possible for us to do this.

In this Embassy, Mexicans and Americans will work together in cooperation and understanding. Here U.S. officials who handle economic, cultural, and political matters will meet with their Mexican associates on projects of mutual interest and joint concern. Here we will receive citizens of Mexico who contemplate visiting the United States, as well as our own citizens who have business to transact with the Mexican Government and the Mexican people.

The official home that we have constructed and dedicate here today is a striking symbol of what can be done by our two countries in joint ventures and in mutual cooperation and friendship.

Some people may be greatly disappointed, because the Alliance for Progress has not achieved the new millenium in 3 short years. No doubt many obstacles and delays in this program will be encountered. But these should not be a cause for despair. They should simply stimulate and inspire us to a firmer resolve to get on with the tasks of economic and social development. For, as President Johnson remarked at the Mexican Embassy in May of last year:

"From the unity achieved through the Organization of American States through the new sense of common purpose arising from the Alliance for Progress—we can believe now that a new day is dawning in the New World. It is a day of unity, a day of cooperation, a day of joint efforts and mutual purpose dedicated to freedom, to social justice, and to universal peace."

"In the fulfillment of this new day," the President said, "we of the United States recognize and believe that the relations between our country and our great next door neighbor, the Republic of Mexico, will always be vital and decisive to the destiny of the hemisphere and of the world." Viva Mexico, el buen vecino.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on yesterday, June 25, 1964, prior to the vote on the last amendment of the day's session offered by Senator LAUSCHE, I made an observation on the floor of the Senate. The transcript of my observation is so badly garbled in the RECORD, on page 14650, as to be incomprehensible. I am quoted as saying:

Excise taxes are not of particular interest to the people of my State. In Wyoming we believe that our best product is our people. Our people believe that if the Government exercises frugality in its operations, there will be no need for excise taxes. But I shall not vote for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, this is entirely out of context. The record will disclose that I have voted "aye" on every attempt to eliminate the excise taxes which are an unwarranted burden upon our people and all people of the United States.

What I did say was the following:

We have no great manufacturing companies in Wyoming but we are interested in excise taxes. In Wyoming we believe that our best product is our people. Our people have the old-fashioned belief that the Government should excise frugality in its expenditures and operations and then there would be no need for the continuation of these ridiculous excise taxes. I have voted for the elimination of all of them, but I shall not vote for the amendment offered on the postulate presented by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD be corrected to show the exact thrust of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The correction will be made, as indicated.

GOVERNOR HATFIELD: "NO" TO FARM LABOR FREEDOMS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute longer than the usual 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon State Committee on Children and Youth is sponsoring the Oregon Youth Harvest Corps which is being created to help harvest crops in Oregon this summer. The Youth Harvest Corps will be a clearinghouse to make work available to young people and to provide fruit and vegetable growers with a supply of harvesters.

Teams of teenage boys and girls will be transported, under adult supervision, to farms where workers are needed. Growers provide suitable housing and recreation while the teams prepare their own meals and do their own housekeeping. The Governor of Oregon, Mark O. Hatfield, has enthusiastically endorsed this program.

But it was with regret and even amazement that I noted Governor Hatfield's advocacy of an extension of Public Law 78, allowing the continued importation of Mexican braceros into this country. This law, which was enacted in an emergency period following World War II, has been thoroughly scrutinized by both Houses of Congress and considered unnecessary. The U.S. Labor Department has supported its repeal. It is unconscionable that Oregonians so enlightened in social problems should desire the continuance of a program that prevents normal economic forces from working in the agricultural labor market and which permits trafficking in human beings as if they were commodities to be bought and sold in a fluctuating market.

The human equation of the migrant and bracero program has been poignantly described in a Senate report of 1960:

The migrant and his family are lonely wanderers on the face of our land. They are living testimonials to the poverty and neglect that is possible even in our healthy and dynamic democracy that prides itself on its protection and concern for the individual. Behind the screen of statistics, showing migrant laborers toiling for as little as 50 cents an hour, and working only 131 days a year, we see families crowded into shelters that are more like coops for animals, with children undernourished and in poor health, 2 or 3 years behind in school, with little chance to fully develop their talents and become useful to themselves and their country. This is the ugliest kind of human waste. The plight of the migrant families is a charge on the conscience of all of us.

The agricultural editor of the Portland Oregonian, reporting the activities of the Governor's symposium on agricultural labor, wrote that those attending the symposium of the Governor adopted a resolution asking for continued importation of Mexican braceros, and this resolution was some weeks later forwarded to me by the Governor. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the articles, the resolution, and the covering letter from the Governor.

There being no objection, the articles, resolution, and the covering letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, May 14, 1964]

HATFIELD GIVES HELP TO BRACERO MEASURE

(By Joe Blanco)

Gov. Mark O. Hatfield Wednesday called for the formation of a statewide committee to cope with what may be a serious farm labor shortage. At the same time, the Governor endorsed a move to seek the extension of the controversial Mexican farm labor law which expires December 31.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

prove the economic and social conditions of the tribal membership.

The proposed legislation will allow program flexibility looking toward permanent economic growth and development of the reservation. We concur with the principles of the tribe's program and recommend that the judgment funds be made available to the tribe for more detailed planning as proposed in the enclosed bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1082)

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (H.R. 11202) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and ask that it be printed and appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from R. V. Segars, addressed to me, and requesting the proposed amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and proposed amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The letter and amendment presented by Mr. JOHNSTON are as follows:

WOODROW, S.C., *June 24, 1964.*

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: It was good to talk to you over the telephone the other night. All of us in South Carolina are proud of you for the way you fought the civil rights bill and I know that you were disappointed to see it pass.

We missed you at our reception but we certainly understood your not being there and we appreciated very much your sending Tom and Bob. It was a pleasure to have them both.

I called your office earlier this week and in your absence talked to Tom Chadwick about a problem that the cotton farmers are facing.

The Department of Agriculture has added another factor called micronaire reading in addition to the classification of grade and staple for establishing the value of cotton in the loan. It is their intention to charge the farmers 6 cents per bale for this service. We feel that the Government should not place any more expense on the farmer and I am sure you agree.

Briefly this cost could be removed from the farmers by obtaining an amendment to H.R. 11202 now pending before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, to provide an increase in funds and authorize usage of them to provide micronaire readings without charge to farmers, in the section of the bill having to do with Agricultural Marketing Service. The suggested language of such an amendment is attached hereto.

Senators from other cotton States are being contacted by their constituents along these same lines.

We would certainly appreciate your help on this matter and we hope that the cotton farmers can be spared any more loss of income.

With kindest personal regards.

Yours very truly,

RAY V. SEGARS, Jr.

ENCLOSURE TO SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON, JUNE 24, 1964

"On page 14, line 12 (of H.R. 11202 as printed and before the committee) delete '$39,389,000' and insert in lieu thereof: '$39,989,000: *Provided,* That on and after July 1, 1964, appropriations available for classing or grading cotton without charge to producers thereof shall be available for providing micronaire readings on cotton without charge to producers thereof; and hereafter there may be transferred to any such appropriation such sums from nonadministrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be necessary for providing such micronaire readings in addition to other funds available for this purpose, such transfer, except for the cost of micronaire readings on cotton in which producers have obtained Commodity Credit Corporation price support, to be reimbursed from subsequent appropriations therefor.'"

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 1081)

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pay raise bill, H.R. 11049. This amendment deals with the pension on retirement pay that Members of Congress receive.

Under existing law, the annual payment is predicated upon the average salaries of the 5 highest years of pay.

My amendment would change that requirement that the base be the 5 highest years, and would make the base the average pay of Members of Congress through the years which they have served.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. CLARK. On behalf of Senators HART, CASE, NEUBERGER, and myself, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed. We intend to offer this amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] to H.R. 11049, an act to adjust and raise the basic compensation of Federal officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the amendment may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1083) is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following new title:

"TITLE VI—INTEGRITY IN GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 601. (a) Each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives (including the Resident Commissioner), each civil or military officer and each employee of the executive or legislative branch of the Government of the United States or any department or agency thereof who is compensated at a rate in excess of $15,000 per annum shall file annually, and each individual who is a candidate of a political party in a general election for the office of Senator or Representative, or Resident Commissioner in the House of Representatives but who, at the time he becomes a candidate does not occupy any such office, shall file within one month after he becomes a candidate for such office, with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

"(1) the amount and source of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts from any relative or his spouse) received by him or by him and his spouse jointly during the preceding calendar year which exceeds $100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, and other facilities received by him in kind;

"(2) the value of each asset held by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, and the amount of each liability owned by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, as of the close of the preceding calendar year;

"(3) all dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction during the preceding calendar year; and

"(4) all purchases and sales of real property or any interest therein by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding calendar year.

"(b) Except as hereinbefore provided, reports required by this section (other than reports so required by candidates of political parties) shall be filed not later than April 30 of each year. In the case of any person who ceases, prior to such date in any year, to occupy the office or position the occupancy of which imposes upon him the reporting requirements contained in subsection (a) shall file such report on the last day he occupies such office or position, or on such later date, not more than three months after such last day, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

"(c) Reports required by this section shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, dealings in securities or commodities, and purchases and sales of real property, when separate itemization is not feasible or is not necessary for an accurate disclosure of the income, net worth, dealing in securities and commodities, or purchases and sales of real property of any individual.

"(d) Each report required by this section shall be made under penalty for perjury. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this section, or who knowingly and willfully files a false report under this section, shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

"(e) All reports filed under this section shall be maintained by the Comptroller Gen-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

eral as public records which, under such reasonable regulations as he shall prescribe, shall be available for inspection by members of the public.

"(f) For the purposes of any report required by this section, a individual shall be considered to have been a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, a Resident Commissioner, or an officer or employee of the executive or legislative branch of the Government of the United States or any department or agency thereof, during any calendar year if he served in any such position for more than six months during such calendar year.

"(g) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'income' means gross income as defined in section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(2) The term 'security' means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b).

"(3) The term 'commodity' means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.SC. 2).

"(4) The term 'dealings in securities or commodities' means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

"SEC. 602. Section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1004) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) Communications to agency: All written communications and memoranda stating the circumstances, source, and substance of all oral communications made to the agency, or any officer or employee thereof, with respect to such case by any person who is not an officer or employee of the agency shall be made a part of the public record of such case. This subsection shall not apply to communications to any officer, employee, or agent of the agency engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for the agency with respect to such case.'

"SEC. 603. (a) (1) There is hereby authorized to be established a Commission to be known as the 'Commission on Legislative Standards' (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission') which shall be composed of four members to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and four members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(2) The members shall be citizens of the United States (A) who are interested in good government and who by reason of professional training and experience are peculiarly qualified to carry out the duties of the Commission, and (B) who hold no elective or party office or position.

"(3) The Commission shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members and shall establish rules for its procedure.

"(4) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"(5) The members of the Commission shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"(b) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(c) (1) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(2) The Commission is authorized without regard to any other provision of law to reimburse employees, experts, and consultants for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their official duties and to make reasonable advances to such persons for such purposes.

"(d) The Commission shall conduct a thorough study of problems of conflicts of interest and of relations with executive and other agencies which confront Members of Congress with a view to devising and recommending measures and procedures to deal with such problems.

"(e) (1) The Commission or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof may, for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, or the chairman of any such subcommittee (with the approval of a majority of the members thereof), and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman of the Commission or the chairman of any such subcommittee. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection.

"(2) The Commission may authorize the Chairman to make the expenditures herein authorized and such other expenditures as the Commission may deem advisable. When the Commission ceases its activities it shall submit to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives a statement of its fiscal transactions properly audited by the Comptroller General of the United States.

"(3) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, independent instrumentality of the Government or congressional committee any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this section; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman of the Commission.

"(f) The Commission shall submit a final report of its activities and the results of its studies and investigations, together with such legislative recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Congress not later than January 30, 1965, at which time the Commission shall cease to exist.

"(g) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

Mr. CLARK. This is the Case-Clark-Neuberger bill, S. 1261, rewritten as an amendment to the pay bill. It requires disclosure by Senators and all members of the executive branch, employees and officers of the Senate and of the House, and Members of the Congress, of their assets, securities, and real property transactions. It requires ex parte communications to regulatory agencies to be made a part of the public record. And it sets up a committee on legislative standards, consisting of four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House, to conduct a study of legislative conflicts of interest of employees of the legislative and executive branches.

AMENDMENT NO. 1084

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to H.R. 1945, the Federal pay bill. The amendment eliminates the proposed $7,500 annual pay increase for Members of Congress. I ask that my amendment be printed.

The congressional pay increase is unjustified, unnecessary, and because it represents a dramatic example to the rest of the country, it could be seriously inflationary.

Members of Congress at their present $22,500 pay level already receive more than three times the income of the average American family.

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, the average income of the American family is $7,200. Only about 2 percent of American families receive this.

When people are paid this handsomely in any line of work, the only convincing argument that even more should be paid is clear proof that without additional pay candidates simply cannot be recruited to do the job.

But in the case of Congress, seats are now more hotly contested than ever. It has become commonplace for candidates for the House of Representatives and their supporters to spend $30,000 or more in a single race.

Senate campaigns in the past few years typically cost $250,000 and up to more than a million dollars for a lone candidate.

When candidates and their supporters are willing to spend this kind of money, how in the world can we say a lush 33⅓-percent increase in salary is needed to secure people willing to serve as Congressmen?

No one has seriously argued that increased pay for Members of Congress will increase the competence or integrity of those who serve in the Congress.

Can this huge increase be justified on moral grounds? Are the trials and tribulations of congressional office so cruel that Members deserve this pay increase as solace? The answer is a loud "No."

A seat in the House or Senate is the best job in the world. If we could afford it, most of us would pay to hold this job. It is challenging, exciting, and gives a marvelous opportunity open to a very tiny minority of Americans for serving country and conscience.

Very few Members are in the Congress for the money. And no one should be. We can get along on the $22,500.

Congress has given itself as well as the rest of the country a tax cut this year. If the Member of Congress has other income, the tax saving will be even more. For the typical Member of Congress this will mean an $800 increase in take-home pay, even if he has no other income. That should be enough.

Implied in the tax cut at the time of its passage was that Congress would keep Federal spending down. How in the world can Congress even pretend to do this, unless it starts with itself.

Can anyone seriously believe in economy if he votes himself a huge one-third increase in salary on top of a salary already three times the size of the income enjoyed by the average American family and higher than the family income enjoyed by all but 2 percent of American families?

On the other hand, the President has made a persuasive case for increasing

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

the pay of executive and judicial Government employees.

Cabinet officers, the judiciary, the entire Federal establishment must receive pay reasonably competitive with private enterprise or the Government simply cannot hire the competence it must have to do an efficient job.

This part of the pay bill is needed and justified. I warmly favor the pay increase for Federal employees, other than Members of the Congress. I stress and repeat I do favor the pay increase for the executive branch and the judiciary.

I will do my best to get a roll call for this amendment to cut out the congressional pay increase.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that in 1955 Congress increased the salaries of Members of Congress from $12,500 to $22,500, an increase of 80 percent?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In 1955 the salaries were $12,500. If the increase is granted, in 1965 they will be lifted to $30,000. That means that in 9 years we will have increased our salaries by 140 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. I believe his figures are accurate. It is true, of course, that there was an expense allowance of $2,500, which some people felt was the equivalent of salary. But the increase was astronomical, and at least 100 percent under any kind of computation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not also true that if we increase our salaries to $30,000, we will also be making ourselves a rich grant by way of increased retirement pay for each succeeding year that we serve in the capacity of Members of Congress?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. It is certainly an additional advantage, because the increased contribution that we make will be matched by the Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I submitted an amendment this morning which will modify the present retirement law so as to make the retirement pay dependent upon the average pay of all the years which a Member of Congress serves in Congress, instead of the five highest years. Under the proposal in the pay increase bill, at the end of 5 years I would be entitled to a pension based on a salary of $30,000, instead of on a salary of $22,500. In my opinion that is a very lucrative emolument, to which I am not entitled.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator makes a good point.

AMENDMENT NO. 1087

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk to H.R. 11049. I ask that it may be received and printed and lie on the table, and also that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, submitted by Mr. MORSE, is as follows:

On page 167, at the end of line 2, insert a new title, as follows:

"TITLE VI

"That each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives (including each Delegate and Resident Commissioner); each officer and employee of the United States who (1) receives a salary at a rate of $10,000 or more per annum or (2) holds a position of grade GS–15 or above, and each officer in the Armed Forces of the rank of colonel, or its equivalent, and above; and each member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party shall file annually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

"(1) the amount and resources of all income and gifts (of $100 or more in money or value, or in the case of multiple gifts from one person, aggregating $100 or more in money or value) received by him or any person on his behalf during the preceding calendar year;

"(2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by or to him and any other person and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him together with any other person as to the close of the preceding year; and

"(3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year to any person who received anything of value on his behalf or subject to his direction or control or who, with his acquiescence, makes payments for any liability or expense incurred by him.

"SEC. 2. Each person required by the first section to file reports shall, in addition, file semiannually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of all dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding six-month period.

"SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the reports required by the first section of this Act shall be filed not later than March 31 of each year; and the reports required by section 2 shall be filed not later than July 31 of each year for the six-month period ending June 30 of such year, and not later than January 31 of each year for the six-month period ending December 31 of the preceding year.

"(b) In the case of any person required to file reports under this Act whose service terminates prior to the date prescribed by subsection (a) as the date for filing any report, such report shall be filed on the last day of such person's service, or on such later date, not more than three months after the termination of such service, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

"SEC. 4. The reports required by this Act shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, and dealings in securities or commodities, when separate itemization is not feasible or not necessary for an accurate disclosure of a person's income, net worth, or dealings in securities, and commodities.

"SEC. 5. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act or who willfully and knowingly files a false report shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

"SEC. 6. (a) As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'income' means gross income as defined in section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(2) The term 'security' means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 77b).

"(3) The term 'commodity' means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 7, sec. 2).

"(4) The term 'dealings in securities or commodities' means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

"(5) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

"(b) For the purposes of any report required by this Act, a person shall be considered to be a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, an officer or employee of the United States and of the armed services as described in the first section of this Act, or a member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party, if he served (with or without compensation) in any such position during the period to be covered by such report, notwithstanding that his service may have terminated prior to December 31 of such calendar year.

"SEC. 7. The Comptroller General shall have authority to issue, reissue, and amend rules and regulations governing the publication of reports, or any part of them. He shall prescribe fees to cover the cost of reproduction. In formulating such rules and regulations, he shall seek to maximize the availability of reports for purposes of informing the public and agencies and officials of the Federal and local governments, and to minimize use of such records for private purposes."

AMENDMENT NO. 1088

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 11049, the Federal employees pay bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FREE IMPORTATION OF WILD ANIMALS AND WILD BIRDS—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1085)

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment (No. 465) intended to be proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and other Senators) to the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN CRITICAL MATERIALS DURING A WAR OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 1086)

Mr. METCALF submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2272) to insure the availability of certain critical materials during a war or national emergency by providing for a reserve of such materials, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES OF BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yesterday I submitted two amendments to the bill H.R. 11049, the Federal pay bill. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] appear as a cosponsor of the amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASSISTANCE TO ELDERLY PERSONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be added as cosponsor of S. 2000, the bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration of Aging."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2664) to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10053) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11376) to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise tax rates.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 9876. An act to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for a special project and study;

H.R. 10053. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; and

H.R. 10814. An act to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to extend the expiration date of certain authorities, thereunder, and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HARTKE:

Editorial tribute to the Cummins Engine Co., of Columbus, Ind., for its community consciousness and civic concern, published in the Columbus (Ind.) Evening Republican of June 23, 1964.

Editorial entitled "Fighting Dropout Problem," published in the Marion (Ind.) Leader-Tribune of June 10, 1964.

Editorial on Cyprus and the United Nations, published in the Rushville (Ind.) Daily Telegram of June 23, 1964.

Editorial entitled "Indiana: Land of Reasonable Taxes," published in the Sellersburg (Ind.) News of June 10, 1964.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "Difficulties of a Small State in the Federal System and Suggestions for Dealing With Them," written by Robert E. Smylie, Governor of Idaho, and published in the spring 1964, issue of State Government.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Resolution in opposition to the Civil Rights Act, adopted by the Searcy, Ark., Civitan Club.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE CONTINUES RECORD OF EFFECTIVE SERVICE—PUBLIC PRINTER HARRISON PROPOSES RELOCATION AND CONSOLIDATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, 104 years ago last Tuesday, President Buchanan signed an act establishing a Government Printing Office. Almost obscured by the momentous events taking place in early March of 1861 as prolog to the Civil War, the U.S. Government Printing Office opened its doors for business. It has served the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government continuously since that time. History and circumstances have demonstrated what a remarkably sound piece of business this was for our Republic.

In the first 6 months of its operation, the Government Printing Office recovered its entire purchase cost of $135,000. Prior to 1873, the proceedings and debates of the Congress were reported in abbreviated form in newspapers, printed by private firms, or contracted for from printers elected by the House and Senate who were, more often than not, different printers for each body. At the conclusion of each session, the Congress was regularly petitioned for redress of losses incurred in reproducing these proceedings. Finally, due to irregularities, delays, and excessive costs, this highly important segment of public printing was placed under the Congressional Printer, and the first CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appeared on March 5, 1873. Since that date, the Congress of the United States has been served effectively and economically by this agency.

In 1861, our Government ministered to the political, economic, and social needs of 32 million Americans. Today, we respond to the vastly expanded requirements of a population approaching 200 million. The Government Printing Office has met the challenge of a nation's government on the move. This agency now employs more than 7,000 persons and occupies a four-building complex a few short blocks from this Chamber. It leases paper-storage facilities in Franconia, Va., as well as document-storage warehouses in both Washington, D.C., and Maryland. In the past fiscal year, the Government Printing Office produced over a billion copies of publications of all classes. This total includes over 8 million copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and 3.8 million copies of the Federal Register. In addition, nearly 2½ billion postal cards were printed in fiscal 1963.

Its Division of Public Documents mailed out 181 million publications, and returned nearly $6 million to the U.S. Treasury from the sale of these publications. The Government Printing Office's dollar volume now exceeds $127 million annually. It includes central-office printing, field-service printing, blank paper supply to Government departments, as well as purchases of printing from commercial contractors. Purchases of printing from commercial contractors accounted for 47 percent of the printing and binding volume for 1963.

This agency is rather unique, since it operates similarly to conventional commercial enterprises: With a working capital used as a revolving fund. For example, when an agency orders printing from the Government Printing Office, the job is done and the publication delivered, together with a bill for the work. During the interval between production and collection, the Printing Office pays its help and purchases paper and supplies, using its revolving fund. When the agency pays its bill, the Government Printing Office reconstitutes its working capital on deposit with the U.S. Treasury. Capital purchases and replacement of obsolete equipment must be made from a small percentage of retained earnings to keep pace with rapidly changing technology which is so characteristic of the printing industry.

Realistic and competitive price structures are testimony as to how well the Government Printing establishment is doing its task. In recent months, Public Printer James L. Harrison, the most capable administrator of this important office, has submitted a proposal to the Congress for vacating the present four-building complex and distant warehousing facilities. Mr. Harrison envisions the relocating and consolidating of Government Printing Office operations at a building especially designed to meet its production and storage needs. Substantially lower operating costs are forecast if the Public Printer's plan is approved, with savings conservatively estimated at nearly $3 million annually. Moreover,

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

92d birthday, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court said:

His devotion to the law, his contributions to the education of members of both bench and bar, and his great contributions to the jurisprudence of our country have not been excelled in our history.

As a representative of the people of Dean Pound's native State, to whom he always remained close, I express our profound sense of loss. At the same time, we must be grateful that much of his wisdom is preserved for us all not only in his extensive writings but in the enduring and viable impression on the law, the bar, and the American philosophy which he leaves as his most impressive monument.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article from this morning's Washington Post reporting Dean Pound's death.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTED LAW DEAN ROSCOE DEAN POUND IS DEAD AT 93

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., July 1.—Roscoe Pound, 93, former dean of the Harvard Law School and known as the grand old man of the law to generations of lawyers, died tonight in the Harvard infirmary.

Although in poor health in recent months, the legendary legal scholar, until recently, strolled from his infirmary quarters to his office in Langdell Hall at Harvard.

In 1961, an association of lawyers in Spain voted him "worldwide patriarch of comparative law." And Mr. Pound's associates in the legal profession called him the man whom lawyers recognize as the greatest student of common law of all time.

On his 92d birthday—October 27, 1962—Chief Justice Earl Warren said of Mr. Pound: "His devotion to the law, his contributions to the education of members of both bench and bar, and his great contributions to the jurisprudence of our country have not been excelled in our history."

TWENTY HONORARY DEGREES

Dean Pound held some 20 honorary degrees from universities in this country and abroad. In 1940, he was awarded the golden medal of the American Bar Association for "conspicuous service to the cause of American jurisprudence."

Born in Lincoln, Nebr., he was the son of Stephen B. Pound, who eventually became a lawyer and a judge. His mother, Laura Biddlecombe Pound, a native of New York, was Mr. Pound's first teacher.

At the University of Nebraska, he majored in botany and did graduate work in plant geography, ecology, and parasitic fungi, earning a B.A., an M.A., and a Ph. D. in the field. He was the first director of the Botanical Survey of Nebraska.

Although he attained far greater prominence in the law, Dean Pound never received a bachelor of laws degree. Admitted to the Nebraska bar in 1890 after a year's law study at Harvard, he practiced for a time in Lincoln, served as commissioner of appeals in the Supreme Court of Nebraska, taught jurisprudence and Roman law at the University of Nebraska, and became dean there in 1903.

After further stints of teaching at Northwestern University and at the University of Chicago, he returned to Harvard in 1910 as Story professor of law. Six years later, still one of the newest members of the Harvard faculty, he was appointed dean.

NOTABLES ON FACULTY

On his faculty over the years were such men as Edward H. Warren, James M. Landis, and Felix Frankfurter. The number of students rose from 791 to a peak of 1,440 in 1925. Among them were Thomas Corcoran, David E. Lilienthal, and Dean Acheson.

Witty, a great storyteller, and a powerful, yet matter-of-fact, speaker who never lost his Nebraska accent, Pound was one of Harvard's most popular lecturers.

In his teaching, he followed the traditional case method, adding others of his own out of his philosophies of sociological jurisprudence. He often turned to illustrations from actual practice, and he treated the ideas of his students seriously.

When he resigned as dean in 1936, Mr. Pound became Harvard's first roving professor, entitled to teach in any faculty of the university he wished.

During the New Deal and afterward, Dean Pound assailed what he called administrative absolutism, contending that the new administrative agencies were seeking exemption from judicial scrutiny.

His critics recalled that in the celebrated speech of 1906 he had condemned the "spectacle of law paralyzing administration." He continued to attack the agencies even after a conservative Congress had enacted the Administrative Procedure Act to rectify the very shortcomings of which he had complained.

HIS LEARNING IS VAST

Dean Pound was renowned for his encyclopedic mind and his vast learning. At 76, already a master of French, German, Italian, Spanish, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, he took up Chinese for a trip to China.

A prolific author, he was revising two articles on labor unions and the law when he flew west to be honored by the American Judicature Society, of which he was the only surviving founder.

Heavy framed, standing 5 feet 10 and weighing 200 pounds in his prime, Dean Pound was long possessed of great physical stamina. According to one story, he could still run a mile in less than 5 minutes at the age of 50

He was variously chairman of the section of legal education of the American Bar Association, president of the Association of American Law Schools, as a member of the standing advisory committee for the juristic section of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation (a League of Nations instrument), and a member of the celebrated Wickersham Commission, whose report to President Hoover in 1931 on the prohibition question caused a national furor.

Mr. Pound sided with the majority in urging a further trial of prohibition but in the individual reports, which the several members of the Commission appended, declared his belief that the more important gains, such as the closing of the saloons and the establishment of Federal control over the liquor business, ought to be safeguarded by a revision of the 18th amendment to permit adaptation to local conditions where it was demonstrably futile to expect total abstinence.

Dean Pound, who was twice a widower, met his second wife as a member of the Wickersham Commission.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business. If not, morning business is closed.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the third time, I reiterate that the Senate is now operating under the Pastore germaneness rule, and for the next 3 hours, at least, I hope Senators will confine themselves to the pay bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I yield for 2 minutes to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in 1932 the Democratic Party adopted what, in my opinion, was the best party platform since I have been active in politics. That platform stated:

We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power.

In 1932 I was elected to the House of Representatives on that platform, and I have never left it, although the party left it a long time ago.

The statesmanship of my predecessor, Carter Glass, can be observed in such planks as these in the 1932 platform:

We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenues, raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay. * * * We advocate the removal of government from all fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and natural resources in the common interest.

And this is what those of us who were elected on that platform promised to do to their own pay:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of the Federal Government.

Promising the splendid voters of the Seventh Congressional District to carry out that platform, one of my first official votes was to vote to cut my own pay from $10,000 to $7,500.

As I have indicated, it did not take the Democratic New Dealers very long to leave the 1932 program. And what has been the result? We now have a

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

debt created by reckless spending of over $300 billion, the annual interest on which is nearly three times the total cost of government when I entered the House 31 years ago.

Instead of abolishing useless commissions and reducing Government employees, we have created a plethora of commissions and we have more than doubled the number of Federal employees. And in recent years, Congress votes in every election year, and sometimes in between, to raise the pay of those employees. The amount involved has become so large that every time Congress raises the pay of Federal employees by 1 percent it costs the taxpayers $100 million.

Throughout my service in the Congress, I have consistently advocated and consistently voted for the economy principles enunciated in the platform on which I was first elected. Never during those 31 years have I ever voted to raise my own pay, and I do not intend to vote for H.R. 11049 which raises the pay of all Members of the Congress by $7,500 per year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD at this time our party platform of 1932, with the hope that its sound provisions will be considered by those who write the platform in Atlantic City next August.

There being no objection, the party platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM FOR 1932

In this time of unprecedented economic and social distress the Democratic Party declares its conviction that the chief causes of this condition were the disastrous policies pursued by our Government since the World War, of economic isolation, fostering the merger of competitive businesses into monopolies and encouraging the indefensible expansion and contraction of credit for private profit at the expense of the public.

Those who were responsible for these policies have abandoned the ideals on which the war was won and thrown away the fruits of victory, thus rejecting the greatest opportunity in history to bring peace, prosperity, and happiness to our people and to the world.

They have ruined our foreign trade; destroyed the values of our commodities and products, crippled our banking system, robbed millions of our people of their life savings, and thrown millions more out of work, produced widespread poverty and brought the Government to a state of financial distress unprecedented in time of peace.

The only hope for improving present conditions, restoring employment, affording permanent relief to the people, and bringing the Nation back to the proud position of domestic happiness and of financial, industrial, agricultural and commercial leadership in the world lies in a drastic change in economic governmental policies.

We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to have [sic] faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe. We hereby declare this to be the platform of the Democratic Party:

The Democratic Party solemnly promises by appropriate action to put into effect the principles, policies, and reforms herein advocated, and to eradicate the policies, methods, and practices herein condemned. We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of the Federal Government. And we call upon the Democratic Party in the States to make a zealous effort to achieve a proportionate result.

We favor maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenues, raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay.

We advocate a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards and an international monetary conference called on the invitation of our Government to consider the rehabilitation of silver and related questions.

We advocate a competitive tariff for revenue with a factfinding tariff commission free from executive interference, reciprocal tariff agreements with other nations, and an international economic conference designed to restore international trade and facilitate exchange.

We advocate the extension of Federal credit to the States to provide unemployment relief wherever the diminishing resources of the States makes it impossible for them to provide for the needy; expansion of the Federal program of necessary and useful construction effected [sic] with a public interest, such as adequate flood control and waterways.

We advocate the spread of employment by a substantial reduction in the hours of labor, the encouragement of the shorter week by applying that principle in government service; we advocate advance planning of public works.

We advocate unemployment and old-age insurance under State laws.

We favor the restoration of agriculture, the nation's basic industry; better financing of farm mortgages through recognized farm bank agencies at low rates of interest on an amortization plan, giving preference to credits for the redemption of farms and homes sold under foreclosure.

Extension and development of the Farm Cooperative movement and effective control of crop surpluses so that our farmers may have the full benefit of the domestic market.

The enactment of every constitutional measure that will aid the farmers to receive for their basic farm commodities prices in excess of cost.

We advocate a Navy and an Army adequate for national defense, based on a survey of all facts affecting the existing establishments, that the people in time of peace may not be burdened by an expenditure fast approaching a billion dollars annually.

We advocate strengthening and impartial enforcement of the antitrust laws, to prevent monopoly and unfair trade practices, and revision thereof for the better protection of labor and the small producer and distributor.

The conservation, development, and use of the Nation's waterpower in the public interest.

The removal of government from all fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and natural resources in the common interest.

We advocate protection of the investing public by requiring to be filed with the Government and carried in advertisements of all offerings of foreign and domestic stocks and bonds true information as to bonuses, commissions, principal invested, and interests of the sellers.

Regulation to the full extent of Federal power, of (a) holding companies which sell securities in interstate commerce; (b) rates of utilities companies operating across State lines; (c) exchange in securities and commodities.

We advocate quicker methods of realizing on assets for the relief of depositors of suspended banks, and a more rigid supervision of national banks for the protection of depositors and the prevention of the use of their moneys in speculation to the detriment of local credits.

The severance of affiliated security companies from, and the divorce of the investment banking business from, commercial banks, and further restriction of Federal Reserve banks in permitting the use of Federal Reserve facilities for speculative purposes.

We advocate the full measure of justice and generosity for all war veterans who have suffered disability or disease caused by or resulting from actual service in time of war and for their dependents.

We advocate a firm foreign policy, including peace with all the world and the settlement of international disputes by arbitration; no interference in the internal affairs of other nations; and sanctity of treaties and the maintenance of good faith and of good will in financial obligations; adherence to the World Court with appending reservations; the Pact of Paris abolishing war as an instrument of national policy, to be made effective by provisions for consultation and conference in case of threatened violations of treaties.

International agreements for reduction of armaments and cooperation with nations of the Western Hemisphere to maintain the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine.

We oppose cancellation of the debts owing to the United States by foreign nations.

Independence for the Philippines; ultimate statehood for Puerto Rico.

The employment of American citizens in the operation of the Panama Canal.

Simplification of legal procedure and reorganization of the judicial system to make the attainment of justice speedy, certain, and at less cost.

Continuous publicity of political contributions and expenditures; strengthening of the Corrupt Practices Act and severe penalties for misappropriation of campaign funds.

We advocate the repeal of the 18th amendment. To effect such repeal we demand that the Congress immediately propose a constitutional amendment to truly represent [sic] the conventions in the States called to act solely on that proposal; we urge the enactment of such measures by the several States as will actually promote temperance, effectively prevent the return of the saloon, and bring the liquor traffic into the open under complete supervision and control by the States.

We demand that the Federal Government effectively exercise its power to enable the States to protect themselves against importation of intoxicating liquors in violation of their laws.

Pending repeal, we favor immediate modification of the Volstead Act; to legalize the manufacture and sale of beer and other beverages of such alcoholic content as is permissible under the Constitution and to provide therefrom a proper and needed revenue.

We condemn the improper and excessive use of money in political activities.

We condemn paid lobbies of special interests to influence Members of Congress and other public servants by personal contact.

We condemn action and utterances of high public officials designed to influence stock exchange prices.

We condemn the open and covert resistance of administrative officials to every effort made by congressional committees to curtail the extravagant expenditures of the Government and to revoke improvident subsidies granted to favorite interests.

We condemn the extravagance of the Farm Board, its disastrous action which made the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Government a speculator in farm products, and the unsound policy of restricting agricultural products to the demands of domestic markets.

We condemn the usurpation of power by the State Department in assuming to pass upon foreign securities offered by international bankers as a result of which billions of dollars in questionable bonds have been sold to the public upon the implied approval of the Federal Government.[1]

And in conclusion, to accomplish these purposes and to recover economic liberty, we pledge the nominees of this convention the best efforts of a great party whose founder announced the doctrine which guides us now in the hour of our country's need: equal rights to all; special privilege to none.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, two questions were submitted to me by my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the questions he asked, with my answers to those questions.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question. At the present time, I believe that the salary of the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration is $20,000, the same salary as is now received by many listed in the bill to be under level 4 of the new pay schedule, including, for instance, the Commissioner of Community Facilities Administration. Could the Senator tell me whether the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration is listed in either level 4 or 5 of the new bill?

Answer. No, the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration is not listed in level 4 or 5 of the executive salary schedule. Under H.R. 11049, this position will continue to be a GS–18 position.

Question. What effect will the failure to include the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration, in either level 4 or 5 of the new pay schedule, have on field positions of the Veterans' Administration?

Answer. It will have no effect. The Chief Benefits Director is rated at grade 18 and the 67 regional field managers are set at grades 15 and 16. Grades 15, 16, 17, and 18 all receive substantial increases under H.R. 11049.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, we are ready to vote.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield for a question. Does the Senator wish me to yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am about to ask unanimous consent to have certain bills considered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield for that purpose to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will call attention to the fact that the majority leader, 3 minutes ago, called attention to the germaneness rule and requested that Senators confine themselves to remarks concerning the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate that, but I would hope the distinguished Senator would let me call up four bills that are important to industry. They will take very little time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN MATERIALS FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report House Concurrent Resolution 300, H.R. 11235, H.R. 11004, and H.R. 11257, and I ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration. These measures, which relate to the disposal of surplus pig tin, molybdenum, zinc, and lead from the national stockpile, were unanimously approved by the Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and by the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, the clerk will state the bills by title.

Is the Senator from Missouri asking for their immediate consideration?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes; I ask for their immediate consideration. In explanation, let me say that industry is very anxious to receive this material. It is all heavily in excess of stockpile requirements. The administration is anxious to sell it. The measures have been passed by the House. They have been approved unanimously by the subcommittee and by the full committee. We are receiving calls from steel companies and others every day now, urging that the measures be passed, because there is a critical shortage in industry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have no objection to these bills, but I wonder if the Senator will withhold his request? We are trying to locate members of the committee. I do not think there will be any objection. I personally have no objection.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will say to my good friend from Delaware that I would not think of asking for immediate consideration if they had not been approved unanimously by the subcommittee, including all members on the other side of the aisle, and by the full committee, where the ranking Republican member of the appropriate subcommittee was present at the meeting this morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am sure it was approved. I did not know whether some Senators wanted to make statements in connection with the bills. That is the real reason I make the request. We are trying to get in touch with them. I am sure there will be no objection. I have none. If the Senator will withhold his request——

Mr. SYMINGTON. I withhold the request.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina for yielding to me.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES SALARY REFORM ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, we are ready to vote on the bill, if there are no further amendments to be offered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have an amendment that I hope the chairman will take. I send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware is the pending amendment. The Clerk will state that amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not realize that there was an amendment pending.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

At the appropriate place insert a new section as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of this bill, the effective date of any increase on any salary of $20,000 or over shall be the first day of the first month after the close of a fiscal year with a balanced Federal budget."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I cannot conceive of there being any objection to the amendment. It merely provides for the temporary postponement of the effective date of the salary increases of those who now are paid $20,000 a year until such time as we balance the budget.

If the administration was really serious when it said that it would balance the budget this is a way to help to accomplish that end. We were told earlier this year that the $11 billion tax cut would stimulate the economy. We were told that the purpose of the tax cut was to stimulate the economy to the extent that it would bring more money into the Treasury than if we did not pass a tax cut.

There have been several increased spending bills. The administration also said these would stimulate the economy. We were told that by increasing our spending and by cutting taxes at the same time we would stimulate the economy and thereby increase the revenue of the Government so that we could balance the budget and pay off our debt.

Personally I have never agreed with the philosophy that we could make ourselves rich by taxing less and spending more while financing ourselves with borrowed money.

I do not believe our Government can spend itself into prosperity on borrowed money any more than a drunkard can drink himself sober.

However, for the moment, I am not quarreling with that newfangled theory on the frontier. If the people on the frontier believe it we should give them an opportunity to express that belief by supporting this amendment. The amendment would apply only to those who receive $20,000 or more a year. It would postpone that increase for that brief period according to their own state-

[1] Inadvertently omitted from the reading of the platform, and later included, was the following statement: "We condemn the Hawley-Smoot tariff law, the prohibitive rates of which have resulted in retaliatory action by more than 40 countries, created international economic hostilities, destroyed international trade, driven our factories into foreign countries, robbed the American farmer of his foreign markets, and increased the cost of production."

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ments or until such time as all those spending the money can curtail their spending and balance the budget.

Unless the chairman is willing to accept the amendment I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I cannot accept the amendment. I am sure the Senator realizes that I cannot accept it, because my acceptance would indicate my approval of an arrangement by which no one in the Federal Government under this bill could have his salary increased above $20,000. It would involve hundreds of people in the executive branch, all the heads of departments, and all the top executives, and it would involve all employees in the career service who would receive more than $20,000. It would throw the whole civil service establishment out of gear. It would knock two or three gears out of the machinery. It would not work. The Senator must realize that if the amendment is adopted there would be perhaps 300 or 400 high-ranking Federal executives who would be adversely affected.

We have studied this bill very carefully and closely, in trying to determine equitable salary scales.

Very shortly there will be coming before us a bill involving not a few million dollars, but a few billion dollars. If the Senator wishes to balance the budget, he can wait until the foreign aid bill comes before us, and he can go to work on that bill.

We already have $6 or $7 billion in the pipeline for foreign aid. He can take some of that money he wishes to save out of the foreign aid. He can balance the budget in that way, if he wishes to do it.

Furthermore, the amendment would result in the stacking of hundreds of employees at the same salary level. Are we going to say to the civil service employees, "We are not doing our duty in balancing the budget, and because we are not doing our duty, you shall not have the increase that you are entitled to"?

I do not believe the Senator from Delaware wants to do that. I say to the Senator that if other Senators had followed me in regard to foreign aid, we could balance the budget today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have supported cuts in foreign aid and shall be supporting them again this year. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina that a great deal of money is wasted in that program; however, there has been a great deal of wasting of money on domestic programs, too. I am not pointing the finger entirely at foreign aid because those who are the beneficiaries of that program do not vote in this country. We waste a great deal of money on many domestic programs which affect the State of the Senator from South Carolina and my own State.

We must recognize the fact that we must cut the entire budget.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the average civil service employee, for whom the Senator expresses so much sympathy, would not be affected by the amendment. The amendment would affect only those who are in the top supervisory status whose salaries are already in excess of $20,000.

I agree that it would result in the stacking up of a great many people. However, let us think of the incentive those people would have who are in a supervisory capacity in the Congress, in the Cabinet, or at the head of an agency. They would have an incentive to eliminate inefficiency in their departments. They would have an incentive to stop the wasting of the taxpayers' money. If they had that incentive and if they cooperated in reducing expenses of the Government, what would they get? They would have their salaries increased that much sooner.

In private industry the incentive plan is used a great deal.

I would not mind labeling this plan as the Johnston incentive plan if the Chairman wants the honor. I have no pride of authorship, even though I am proud of offering this plan. It could be called either the Senator Johnston incentive plan or the President Johnson incentive plan.

President Johnson said that he would balance the budget. If that is so, why would he complain about waiting a brief time before putting these increases into effect? If he is only talking for political propaganda purposes to the American taxpayer, which I really think he is doing, and if he has no intention of balancing the budget Senators should reject the amendment and say that if it were accepted these people would never get a salary increase.

I am not accusing the President of bad faith, even though he has asked for an appropriation which is $5½ billion more than President Kennedy received in the preceding year.

He talks loud about economy, but actually he is proving to be the most extravagant President ever to occupy the White House.

We will cut these appropriations if our salary increase as well as the salary increase for top executives in the Government were contingent upon our balancing the budget I venture to say that we would find a great deal of enthusiasm in Congress, in the Cabinet, and throughout the executive branch to trim down expenses, especially if we all felt that our own pocketbooks were affected.

Certainly there is no justification for increasing our salaries by 33⅓ percent and telling the American people that for an indefinite period in the future we intend to borrow the money with which to pay for our salary increases.

If that were done by a corporation in private industry that corporation would soon have a new board of directors. I am not too sure that there will not be a new board of directors in Government, too. The taxpayers may change it in November.

So long as the Senator from South Carolina cannot accept this most sensible amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 30 minutes of debate allowed on the amendment, with 15 minutes controlled by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and 15 minutes by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, if the amendment were adopted we would find that employees in the GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18 grades would all be compressed in one place at $20,000. The same thing would apply to heads of departments and others in positions of responsibility, earning more than $20,000; they also would be stacked together at the $20,000 level.

Anyone who understands the structure of the Federal service will realize that this would be a bad situation, because it would wreck the salary systems set forth in this bill.

Why penalize the employees, the people who would be affected by the amendment? The Senator from Delaware would provide that only when the budget had been balanced would many of these receive their pay increases. Does he expect the employees to balance the budget? Whose job is it to balance the budget? Have the civil service employees as a body responsibility to do that? No. It is the job of Congress to balance the budget. Yet it is proposed by the amendment to shoulder them with the responsibility for something that Congress should be doing.

As I see it, the amendment has no merit whatsoever at the present time. If it is desired to balance the budget, let it be done when the big appropriation bills come from the Committee on Appropriations.

We cannot expect to balance the budget if we continue to give away billions of dollars in foreign aid and spend billions of dollars for defense. But is there anyone who does not want us to defend our country? I do not believe so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Perhaps the Senator from South Carolina recalls that a similar amendment was offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] to the tax-reduction bill. The amendment provided that the tax cut should not become effective until after the budget had been balanced.

The Senator knows that this is the kind of amendment that is repeatedly offered to bills that might cost the Government some money. Such amendments always provide that the programs are not to become effective until after the budget has been balanced.

This issue involves a simple matter of priority. If Senators desire to provide a pay raise for Government employees, they should vote against the amendment. If they do not want the Government employees to receive a pay raise, they should vote for the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma as much time as he may desire.

Mr. MONRONEY. If there is any logic to the proposal of the distinguished

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Senator from Delaware, it would be to save enough money by not passing the pay raise bill to contribute to a balanced budget. That is one way in which to read the amendment. But I do not believe that any of us are waiting to be ransomed in order to effect reductions or economies in the public debt, veterans' benefits, the farm program, or anything else. We will use a sharp ax whenever we can, but we do not intend to accept a bribe by denying Federal employees pay raises in order to save money; by saving the money the Senator from Delaware intends to cut out of the pay bill.

We all desire a balanced budget; but we cannot deny justifiable pay raises until the budget has been balanced.

The bill provides for a net cost in pay increases of $556,836,341. The benefits would flow to 1,732,602 employees.

Among the employees who would be affected by the Senator's amendment would be the small cadre of executives—377—that the President has asked for, whose salaries would be raised by the bill to the new executive pay levels at a cost of about $2,800,000.

At the very most, the cost of the raises for classified workers in the civil service brackets and for postal workers would be in the neighborhood of $555 million. Less than $4 million of that cost would be saved by the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

While judges have little or nothing whatever to do with the economy or with effecting cuts in the budget, the amendment would withdraw the much needed pay raise for district judges, circuit judges, other judges of the Federal courts, and the members of their staffs. Again, there would be a saving of $4,900,000, roughly, out of $556 million.

When we come to Members of Congress and the staffs, who would receive salaries in excess of $20,000, there would be a saving of $4,500,000.

Therefore, the amendment, in full effect, would postpone for several years the much needed raises and, at the same time, would deny the right of the Executive to choose and the employ of personnel of great ability in the executive department to work for all the economy possible in Government. There would be a saving, roughly, of only $16,200,000. Deducting that from the total cost of the bill, $556 million, would still leave as the cost of the bill approximately $540,600,000.

I disagree with the Senator from Delaware about the wisdom of denying a pay increase. If the Senator is serious about desiring to balance the budget, all he need do is to vote "nay" on the pay bill, and he will vote to effectuate a total saving to the Government of $556 million. If it is desired to effect a saving, that is the way to do it, rather than to suggest that by withholding $16 million of salaries, there will be a balanced budget.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate supporting the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. I shall do so principally on the basis that it is some evidence of a sentiment in the Senate that we ought to start thinking about balancing the budget.

It is true that if the bill is passed, the savings will not be of great consequence. But the savings will, at least, convey a message to the people of the United States that there are some Members of Congress who are convinced that we cannot proceed interminably with unbalanced budgets.

We talk about unbalanced budgets. In the Foreign Service retirement fund, 30-percent contributions of the workers' salaries will be required to keep that fund solvent. At present, the employees are contributing 6½ percent. If the fund is to be kept solvent, there will have to be a contribution by the Government of 23½ percent of the amount of the salary.

The obligations of the retirement fund for civil service employees are $49 billion. There is $14 billion in the fund. Unfunded is $35 billion. That unfunded obligation is owed by the Federal Government.

But what are we doing about it? With $35 billion unfunded, every time Congress raises salaries, it also raises, eventually, the obligation of the Government in the retirement operation. When this pay raise bill is passed, there will be a new obligation of $1,300 million upon the retirement fund. That will be an obligation that has not been funded at all. The taxpayers will have to meet that obligation.

The beneficiaries, each year for 5 years, will be entitled to 6 percent more of retirement pay, as stated by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] yesterday. My question is: Can we be rationalizing if we believe that this kind of activity can continue? My answer to that question is that we cannot be. It is against the law of nature. Nature will not tolerate it. The time will come when there will be an accounting; and the worse we make the condition the more painful the accounting will be.

I repeat that the amount of money which would be saved by the amendment of the Senator from Delaware would be inconsequential, but his proposal is of great importance because at least it would send out word to the country that there are some in Congress who are beginning to worry about where the country is heading.

In my judgment, we are running downhill madly——

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on whose time is the Senator from Ohio speaking?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am speaking on the time of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. JOHNSTON. Good.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We are running downhill madly, with the brakes loose.

I wish to give an example of where we are heading. The exhibitors of foreign countries at the New York World's Fair are in need of service for their pavilions, and I wish to read what is happening to the reputation of the United States which is being damaged by——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes, if the Senator from Delaware will permit me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 10 minutes remaining. How much time does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I read:

> The reputation of the United States is being damaged by a shakedown of countries which accepted invitations to participate in the fair. The principal subcontractor on the fairgrounds is charging exhibitors $17 an hour for plumbers, $11 for carpenters, $10 for painters, and $8 for unskilled laborers.
>
> At one such pavilion, the operator was charged $150 for work on a stopped sink, and then he reported the job was botched.

Keep on with this policy and we shall be adding fuel to what is happening throughout the country on the inordinate demands being made upon those people who wish to buy goods and services.

I thank the Senator from Delaware for allowing me to have the floor for these 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I disagree completely that the savings under the amendment can be measured by the dollar amounts involved. There may be only approximately $30 million of real reduction under this amendment, but this will be an incentive on the part of Members of Congress who vote for these appropriations and on the part of the executive branch and the heads of these agencies, who recommend the appropriation or approve the expenditures, to cut down expenses and appropriations and eliminate some of the unnecessary waste and extravagance which we all know does go on in the Government and which every Member of Congress will admit goes on in the Government.

Certainly if we have the top officials of the Government placed in the position that they cannot get their salary increases until they have demonstrated that they are worthy of them, this would be a greater incentive on them.

It is true that there will be some stacked up at the top, but in order to get them unstacked let us balance the budget. If anyone believes that we are really going to balance the budget then the postponement is only for a temporary period of time.

There are those who have been telling the taxpayers that they are going to balance the budget, and they should support the amendment. If they do not

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

believe what they are saying they should vote against the amendment and admit to the taxpayers that they are speaking for political purposes only. I do not believe we will ever balance the budget under the present administration policies.

I am not unmindful that since 1930 we have never balanced the budget but 6 of those 34 years—28 of those years we have lived beyond our income.

I am also not unmindful of the fact that since 1900, with the exception of 3 years, the Democratic Party has never operated the Government with a balanced budget.

I have no faith whatever in the promise of this administration to balance the budget, particularly under this newfangled theory that we can cut taxes and increase spending, all at the same time, and end up in a couple of years with enough money to make it possible to balance the budget. We cannot do it in private business, we cannot do it in private families, and we cannot do it in the Government.

Let them tell the taxpayers what is meant. Let them tell them the truth.

This amendment is merely to separate the truth of the matter. Do we really believe we are going to balance the budget? If we do then vote for the amendment and go home and say that we shall have a salary increase in a very short period of time. But if we do not believe it then go ahead and vote against it.

Certainly this amendment can be justified. Certainly no Member of Congress can go home to his constituents and justify having voted for a 33⅓-percent salary increase when he tells them that that increase is being financed solely out of borrowed money.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Out of the 3 minutes I have left, I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, first let me say to my good friend, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], that there is much merit in his amendment.

I should like to inquire of him when he refers to the Federal budget, does he mean the administrative budget? I believe the legislative history should show that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. As certified by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MILLER. Second, suppose that there is a Federal balanced budget, let us say, for the next fiscal year, and the salary went into effect the following fiscal year and there was an unbalanced budget, would the salaries still stay in effect?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The salaries would stay in effect under the amendment, but if we can ever get this Government's spending controlled perhaps we can hold it. I am concerned over the fact that there is no evidence that in the near future we shall be able to control spending in the Government.

We had the Director of the Budget before our committee, who bragged of the fact that deficits did not just happen, he said that they were planned that way.

In other words, they brag and say that there is virtue in a "planned deficit." I am concerned about this new idea on the Potomac frontier that there is virtue in spending more than we have and that the Director of the Budget claims that he plans these deficits because they thought they would stimulate the economy. We were told that they have no prospects of balancing the budget until 1968, which by the way happens to be another presidential campaign year. I suppose they will then be promising to balance the budget.

The American taxpayer is getting tired of living on these promises.

If the administration means what it says, let us vote for this amendment and say that these salary increases for Congress and top executives will not go into effect until we actually bring about what has been promised—a balanced budget.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for 1 minute?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have 5 minutes left—I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

The significance of this is not so much in balancing the budget as in its impact on inflation. It does not necessarily follow that because we have a deficit of a billion dollars that we have inflation of a billion dollars. But, in the present structure of the economy, and under the present monetary policy of the administration, it works out that way.

For example, during 1961, 1962, and 1963, while we were going $20 billion deeper into debt, we had $21 billion of inflation.

This, I believe, is the significance of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. It is designed to stop this continued inflation, which some so-called economists are trying to discount, but, nevertheless, is hurting many people in the United States.

I commend the Senator from Delaware on his amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Before the rest of my time expires I point out again that this amendment does not affect the average civil service employee one iota, nor does it affect the postal workers, and so forth. This amendment affects only those top officials of the Government whose salaries are in excess of $20,000 and who are directly responsible for whatever excess spending goes on in the Government.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that if the senior Senator from Delaware wants economy, if he wants to go a half billion toward balancing the budget, he should take a direct, affirmative course and vote against this bill, which he has every right to do. I do not intend to do it. The bill provides only $16.2 million for those, roughly, falling in the $20,000 and above class.

The very men whose responsibility and training are needed and who must be procured by the Bureau of the Budget, are needed to effect the economy—not the meat-ax kind of economy, but the general economy. They cannot be hired at $20,000. We cannot get a comptroller or a good finance man. We cannot pull this type of man into the Government service at $20,000 a year—the men who can effectuate the kind of economy we seek in order to balance the budget.

We have to bring in more talent, more young men, more people of ability, CPA's, and auditors to reach down deep into the departments and effectuate economies, consolidation, and deletion of various programs if we expect to come within the terms of a balanced budget. And cutting $16.2 million out of this bill will not do it.

If we want to make a substantial start, then the Senator should—and I expect he will—vote against the entire pay bill. But I call attention to the fact that those receiving above $20,000 a year, who would be affected by his amendment, are largely judges, and high-level civil service and postal employees. They have not had a pay raise in the past 4 or 5 years. Pay raises have gone to those who receive below $20,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time fo the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN MATERIALS FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 30 seconds?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, earlier today, I reported four measures to authorize the disposal of four materials held in the national stockpile. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of these four measures. I also request that appropriate excerpts from the committee reports be printed in the RECORD in connection with the consideration of these measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSAL OF PIG TIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the im-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1964

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Corinthians 2: 5: *That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.*

Infinite and eternal God, in this new day may our hearts go out to Thee in a longing to be blessed with a vital and vivid experience of Thy presence and power.

May our fellowship with Thee be more intimate, more personal and satisfying, delivering us from all feelings of fear and frustration, of doubt and despair.

Grant that the thoughts of our minds and the meditations of our hearts may move out toward the far horizons of faith and hope.

We pray that the world with its apparent moral and spiritual apathy and indifference may realize that there is no escape from all miseries and disappointments until Thy spirit is enthroned in the life of man.

Inspire us to think and plan in terms of humanity and with a vision of the love of God for all mankind.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CIVIL RIGHTS

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, what extremist civil rights leaders have threatened would be a summer of racial violence and tension obviously has begun in Tuscaloosa, Ala.

The demonstrations of recent days furnish additional warning to the country, if any were needed, that civil rights extremists pose a growing threat to every American community.

Let me say again, as I have said in the past, that those who believe that passage of the so-called civil rights legislation will appease the mobs in the streets of Tuscaloosa or Chicago or New York are badly mistaken. In fact, passage of such legislation will inevitably lead to even greater demands and excesses on the part of irresponsible leaders of the civil rights movement, whose only aim is the extension of their own personal power.

Faced with this latest challenge to law and order, the law enforcement officials of Tuscaloosa again have handled an extremely difficult task in a way that does credit to their community and the entire State of Alabama.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY RAISE BILL

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Federal employees pay raise bill has come to the floor on such short notice. Taking into account the previously announced schedule I have made commitments which cannot now be broken. This makes it impossible for me to be here for the final vote on this bill. I want to announce, however, that because of the changes which have been made in the bill since it was last considered it has been my intention to support it. If we are to expect the highest type service and performance from our Federal employees then we must be ready to pay salaries which are in line with those in the private sector of our economy. I have great respect for the postal workers and the other Federal employees. I have every confidence that these fine people will honor the faith we are reposing in them and will live up to the high standards of performance and conduct which has been a part of the history of Federal service. I am confident that this pay increase will result in a more efficient operation of our Government. I am not in full sympathy with that portion of the bill which deals with increasing congressional salaries; however, it involves less than 1 percent of the total increase. The lowering of the amount from that previously considered and making the effective date in January of 1965 makes it somewhat more acceptable.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 154]

Abele	Diggs	Long, La.
Ashmore	Dorn	Long, Md.
Auchincloss	Dowdy	McIntire
Baring	Evins	May
Bass	Forrester	Miller, N.Y.
Battin	Frelinghuysen	Osmers
Bolling	Fulton, Tenn.	Pepper
Bolton, Oliver P.	Gray	Powell
	Green, Oreg.	Rains
Bromwell	Gurney	Roberts, Ala.
Bruce	Healey	Sheppard
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Shipley
Burton, Utah	Karth	Thompson, La.
Celler	Kee	Toll
Clark	Kilgore	Winstead
Clausen, Don H.	Knox	Wright
	Lloyd	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INCREASE IN GOVERNMENT SALARIES

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to take the most stupid step it has taken in many years. How, just how, can we take action in May to legislate the price of wheat down from $2 to $1.72 and then in June legislate our own salary up from $22,500 to $30,000?

JOURNALISTIC RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday an Associated Press story filed by Stanley Meisler crossed over into the area of journalistic irresponsibility.

In reporting an adverse Navy report on my bill, House Congressional Resolution 206, to express the thanks of the American people to Drs. Ross Gunn and Philip Abelson for their part in developing nuclear propulsion for submarines, Mr. Meisler quoted me as saying the following about Adm. H. G. Rickover: "I admire the old so-and-so."

Mr. Speaker, this is not the truth and I herewith demand a retraction from Associated Press.

The reporter did not talk with me prior to using this quotation. In fact, I have not talked with him in several months. When he did last talk with me, I referred to Admiral Rickover in a completely respectful manner. At no time did I refer to the admiral as an "old so-and-so."

But my greatest concern over the unfortunate Associated Press article is not that I have been misquoted. I am more concerned that a wrong impression of two fine scientists, Drs. Gunn and Abelson, may have been left in the minds of millions of readers.

For the record I want it known that when I introduced my resolution, I had never met, talked with, nor corresponded with Dr. Gunn or Dr. Abelson. I still have not had any contact with Dr. Abelson and have met Dr. Gunn only briefly. At no time has either of the two men asked me to do anything for him, nor encouraged passage of my resolution. They have not asked for thanks. Rather I have determined that they deserve thanks.

The Navy report begs the question and is not accurate. In due time and in my own manner, I shall prove this point.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

In the meantime, it should be remembered that Admiral Rickover is not at issue. He has been justifiably commended for the important role he has played in developing the nuclear submarine and I have joined in that commendation. Certainly the statement of historical facts which occurred before Captain Rickover joined the nuclear propulsion program cannot and should not minimize what Captain Rickover did after 1946.

It is unfortunate that an unethical reporter in his desire to write sensationally at the expense of honesty has tried to ascribe an ulterior motivation to my resolution and has brought Admiral Rickover into the controversy. It is unfortunate that this reporter's questionable ethics may have caused embarrassment to two great scientists who have done so much for their country.

MODERNIZATION OF FEDERAL SALARY SYSTEMS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 733 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049,) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may require.

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 733 provides for consideration of H.R. 11049, a bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 4 hours of general debate and further provides that the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule by titles instead of by sections.

The purpose of H.R. 11049 is that postal and other Federal career employees shall be paid salaries comparable to salaries paid workers in private enterprise for comparable levels of responsibility, skill, and performance, and to partially remedy the serious inadequacies in the Federal executive, congressional, and judicial salary structure.

Enactment of this legislation is imperative if the Congress is to abide by its obligation resulting from the enactment of Public Law 87-793. H.R. 11049 will fulfill that obligation and, in addition, establish reasonable, just, and meaningful relationships between postal and other career salary levels and the rates of compensation for positions of the highest executive, legislative, and judicial responsibility. The salaries attached to such legislative, executive, and judicial positions also are properly related in level as among all three branches of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 733.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 733 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 11049, the Federal Salary Act of 1964.

Mr. Speaker, we had before us a short time ago in this present year a bill very similar to this which was defeated by a majority of 38 votes, which is quite a good majority.

Apparently there is a new technique in the Congress of the United States, and that is that if a bill that is desired by the administration or by certain powers that be does not pass the House it is brought back in a modified form, a little work is done on the outside, maybe some on the inside, and then the bill is passed.

We have been reliably informed that this bill will pass by a majority of 20 votes, which will necessitate quite a little changeover, which I have no doubt will be adequately taken care of.

There is great difference of opinion in some quarters.

There are those who do not think this bill is any better than the last one. In fact, there are some people, among others, some of the Federal employees and their representatives who do not even think this bill is as good as the last bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have asked the gentlewoman to yield because I know she is exceptionally well informed on this measure. She is a member of the legislative committee that handles this bill as well as a member of the Committee on Rules. I have asked the gentlewoman to yield for the purpose of reminding the House, as the gentlewoman knows, that just within the last few days the Committee on Rules has reported to the floor for action next week two other bills as well as this measure. Next Wednesday we will have before us a bill to extend for another year the Korean war emergency excise taxes as well as other excise taxes although the Korean war has been over for 11 years. We will also have on Thursday of next week, as I understand the legislative schedule, a bill to increase the national debt limit to an alltime high of $324 billion, so that we can borrow more money for deficit financing. Those two bills will come up after we are asked to vote on this particular measure which, of course, will carry a cost tag estimated at $535 million per year.

I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding because I believe the House should have in mind before it considers this bill what the Members must pass upon next week in the way of legislation.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from a letter which many of you have received on this subject from one of the organizations of the Federal employees in which it is stated:

H.R. 11049 is a monstrous distortion of the comparability policy and an unjustified departure from the rule prescribed by the Congress for implementing that policy.

Then they proceed to say that in this particular this bill is not as good as the bill that was defeated on the floor of the House.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the House is not in order. I would like to hear what the gentlewoman is saying.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken. The House will be in order.

The gentlewoman from New York will proceed.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I do not blame the House for not listening, Mr. Speaker, because after all this is pretty well warmed over. They have all heard the arguments before and they are going to hear them again for 4 hours and they probably all know pretty well how they are going to vote now.

That is one of the unfortunate things about our system.

I would like to read you some words which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which some of you may have heard, which were delivered by a very distinguished Member of this House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], at the time we had our great tax bill in which we remitted $11½ billion in taxes.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] had this to say at the end of his remarks, and I think it is good to remember those words now before we go out and vote more money on this particular occasion.

But let me conclude with this caution. In the face of a tax cut of $11.5 billion, on top of a deficit of some $10 billion for fiscal 1964, our risk is great. A minimal dose of inflation will offset billions in tax reduction. Our action today will be a cruel hoax on our retired citizens living on fixed incomes, on those who are buying life insurance, or Government bonds—including those of our States and municipalities. We rob all of these through inflation.

Our action today can bring about devastating inflation if we fail to use commonsense in our monetary policy—if business and labor fail to exercise an inflexible control over prices and wages, and if the Congress and the President do

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

not live up to their pledges of economy in Government.

If we pass this bill and then forget about the need to hold the line on spending, we will be inviting disaster. In voting for this bill, I hope each and every one of us binds himself to that provision that still remains in the bill as section 1—to a firm commitment against unnecessary spending.

So, after that and after hearing and applauding these remarks, we voted for the tax cut. We have come in ever since and we have added appropriations. We come in here today to do the same thing.

Much has been made of the congressional salaries. Of course, the congressional salaries are the most unimportant part of this bill. Their only import is that they are some sort of "political dynamite." In this bill it has been arranged that they will not take effect until 1965.

Mr. Speaker, it might have been far better if this bill had been laid over and taken up in the first weeks of 1965, to be passed then.

As for comparability, I have always felt that it was nonexistent to a great extent. On the other hand, the escalator clause, which I have always advocated, is now to a great extent in effect.

I understand that an amendment will be offered to this bill to put that into effect for the congressional and executive salaries as well.

Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent amendment, and I hope that when it is offered the House will subscribe fully to it. There is no reason why what is sauce for the goose should not be sauce for the gander. It is quite an obvious thing that it is an embarrassment to Members of this House and to Members of the other body to vote on their own salaries, whether up or down.

To return to the premise that when a bill has been defeated—and soundly defeated, if I may say so—it can be brought back with a few little changes—$2,500 taken off the congressional salary—I do not believe that will make too much of a difference. Certainly it will make no difference to the people who oppose the bill, and certainly it will make very little difference to the people who are to receive it.

I feel, considering what happened to the old bill, now scrapped, H.R. 8986, that what applied then applies today and there is really no reason why the House should give this new bill a rule; although I am sure you will do it, I still believe that the rule should be defeated and that the House should go on to other business, to new business of increasing importance.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I certainly commend the gentlewoman for her expressions and advice to the House to not adopt this rule. I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

On page 127 of the committee report are the minority views on H.R. 11049, in which there is stated, under the title "Highhanded Committee Procedure—No Hearings Held," the subtopic "Legislation Too Important for No Hearings." I should like to know whether or not this is an accurate statement of the procedures; whether the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held hearings in regard to this legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY. That is erroneous. Hearings were held on the bill; extensive hearings.

Mr. CURTIS. The statement here is:

> The last public hearing at which any person testified before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on the subject of salary legislation was on October 15, 1963.

Is that a true statement?

Mr. MURRAY. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. All right. Let me go to the previous statement:

> H.R. 11049 was introduced in the House on April 28, 1964. Copies of the bill were made available to the members of the committee the following afternoon, April 29. It was then made the order of business at an executive session of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee scheduled for 10 a.m. the next morning, April 30. When the committee finally convened at 10:35 a.m., a motion was immediately made to consider the bill and to dispose of it and all amendments thereto by 11:20 a.m. After brief and restricted debate the motion was voted up and there then remained approximately 30 minutes for the offering of amendments and for what should have been a full and complete discussion of a measure that in its 5 titles and 78 pages changes the salary rates for almost 2 million Federal employees. In ordering the bill reported, it took a rollcall vote, which prevailed by only a one-vote margin, to adopt an amendment giving those opposed to the bill sufficient time to express their views to the House in this minority report.

Is this a correct statement?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not think so.

Mr. CURTIS. What error was there? Was this bill considered by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee without any discussion, without any reading of it, and without any debate, which is the allegation here?

Mr. MURRAY. Why, certainly not. They had ample hearings on the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. You have already admitted your definition of "ample." If the gentlewoman will yield further, what I want to point out is I think this is a disgrace to the House of Representatives to consider a measure of this importance with this kind of preparation. We who are not on this committee have a right to be able to count on the committee to which this legislation has been referred to have conducted adequate hearings which will be available and to have adequate reports. This matter cannot be considered with any intelligence on the floor of the House in the light of the incomplete homework that has been done in this area. If the Congress and this House is simply to exist as a forum for pressures to be applied that have no relation to study and are simply pressures that are generated outside the Congress, we might just well be a house of delegates simply to conduct public opinion polls instead of a deliberative body. I suggest to my colleagues that this is the essence of representative government that is thwarted by these kinds of procedures. I would not care whether one was for or against this bill or other legislation, but if this House, under this kind of leadership, continues in this fashion, gentlemen, I can tell you that representative government has gone from this country. I see there is some laughter over there on the Democratic side, but think well of what is being done here and what has been done previously in this House this year. We are very, very close to exactly what I have described—a major decline of representative government. I would suggest that we do vote this rule down and that the committee conduct the proper kind of studies and hearings so that the House can view this matter with some intelligence.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. In response to the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] I wish to state categorically that not one single witness appeared before the committee either for or against H.R. 11049. The minority asked that at a minimum the chairman of the Civil Service Commission and a representative of the Bureau of the Budget be called before the committee. We were denied any witnesses at all on this pending bill.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I think this colloquy may have left a misleading impression. The authors of the minority views have chosen their words rather carefully, and what they have said here is probably true technically, but the subject of this very bill occupied this committee's time for nearly a full year. The committee took volumes of testimony on this bill. We have heard it and debated it and the whole House held hearings, in effect, with 2 days of debate back in March.

There is nothing unprecedented about bringing out a clean bill in a situation where a clean bill is indicated. This is not technically and strictly a situation where a clean bill is indicated, but clean bills have been voted out with 5 minutes of debate. This bill came out by a vote of 14 to 3. And it had bipartisan support in the committee. If these outrageous, unprecedented procedures had been used, I am sure the vote would have been different. The gentleman from Iowa, the gentleman from Michigan, and others who have opposed all legislation of this kind—our committee could hear testimony until the day of resurrection, and there still would not be enough consideration to satisfy them.

This bill was fairly and adequately considered for over a year. It is almost identically the same bill that we debated for 2 days in March. I cannot see that there is much substance to charges of this kind.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribu-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

tion. But I would like to remind him that the bill he is telling us about, and the year of hearings that it had, was a bill that was defeated on the floor of this House by a majority of 38 votes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add the further observation that what we are voting on here today is not the broad subject. We are voting on specific substance as written into this bill. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has said, and as I believe the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has said, there are those who find provisions in this bill that are eminently unsatisfactory, persons who represent the employee unions themselves, and they are convinced that this is not the same old subject matter. This is different substance.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

(Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us covers all Federal employees; postal employees, and other classified employees. It also provides increases for judges and other persons in the executive branch. There is a provision that the congressional increase of $7,500 is to become effective in January of next year.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress, the salary of a Member was $10,000. Throughout the years I frequently took the floor urging that the Members recognize the problems that confront them and that they bring about a justifiable increase in salary for Members of the Congress of the United States.

Some years ago I offered an amendment to increase the salaries of Members to $22,500, long before the present level of salaries was reached. It was then subject to a point of order and a Member, exercising his rights under the rules, made the point of order. If the point of order had not been made it would have been before the House. In any event, I offered the amendment.

The last salary increases received by Members of Congress was in 1956. Since that time salary increases for postal employees have been approximately 41 percent and for other employees about 40 percent. Those increases were justified and we gave them to them.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is any Member who feels, or very few Members who feel in their own mind, no matter how they are going to vote on this bill, but what Members of Congress are justified in an increase and to the increase specified in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the problems now existent are more far reaching than ever before. We know what the cost of campaigning is. Every one of us realizes the tremendous expenses involved in connection with campaigning. This has a relationship to salaries, although it is not an argument which I am making in relation to that question, because we are justified in the increase provided for in this bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, the thing that worries me is whether or not someday—and it is not in the remote future—that holding public office, particularly major office, is going to be confined to those of wealth. I believe a body like this should be representative of the people. I do not believe that those of sufficient wealth to hold public office should be excluded, but I regret to see the day when a situation exists in connection with the Congress of the United States or in connection with the elections which are held for Governor and to the U.S. Senate and other major offices, where only those holding and possessed of unusual wealth can undertake the burdens of conducting a campaign. That would be a sad day for our country for any particular segment of our society, because of unusual circumstances, to be able to dominate the legislative processes of our Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take the floor, talking impersonally, but with strong conviction to my colleagues, that the American people in the main recognize that Members of Congress are entitled to an increase in salary. The great majority of the American people realize that the last increase was some time ago. When they realize that the last increase was in 1956, and it has been 8 years since there has been an increase, and at the same time being aware of the increase in the cost of living and the other problems confronting Members of the Congress of the United States and their families, they will realize that they are entitled to the increase provided for in this bill, which increase will take effect in January of next year.

Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence that the people of the congressional district which it is my honor to represent overwhelmingly recognize the justification for the provisions contained in this bill in connection with the Members of Congress and also the judges of our Federal courts.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believes that judges' salaries should not be tied up with those salaries which are paid to the Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of California). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. However, we recognize that historically these salaries are tied to the salary structure of the Congress of the United States and they cannot be separated.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who feels, because we do not want to increase our own salaries, that we should not increase the salaries of others where a case is made out. But, again, I recognize the historical factors and that one cannot be separated from the other. Every one of us in our own mind admits that we are entitled to an increase in salary and that the judges are entitled to an increase in salary and that those occupying responsible positions in the executive branch of Government are entitled to a salary increase.

Mr. Speaker, also included in this bill is a salary increase for all Federal employees.

I take the floor at this time simply to place myself in the position of favoring the bill and urging that the rule be adopted and that the bill do pass.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODERNIZATION OF FEDERAL SALARY SYSTEMS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11049 with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might require.

Mr. Chairman, the committee bill, H.R. 11049, is almost unique in the history of your Post Office and Civil Service Committee in that it has the strong support of the President of the United States, all major organizations of postal and other Federal employees, great professional and business groups such as the American Bar Association and the American Bankers Association, and outstanding leaders in all fields of Government, industry, and research. The bill was reported from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee without amendment by a nearly five to one majority.

The purposes of this legislation are identical to those of our earlier salary bill, H.R. 8986, but this new bill is far less costly because it includes major economy provisions which were approved by the House during its consideration of H.R. 8986. The chief cost reductions are achieved in title I of H.R. 11049, which is substantially identical to the amendment I offered, and the House approved, to title I of the earlier bill.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

H.R. 8986 as reported would have cost $668 million. This bill (H.R. 11049) will cost $533 million or a saving of $135 million.

Title I of H.R. 11049 makes only three substantive changes in the language approved by the House when title I of the earlier bill was considered. One authorizes the Postmaster General, in certain cases where a postal employee who is senior in total postal service to another postal employee who is receiving a higher salary, to advance the senior employee in salary. Another corrects the present excessive gap between the top salary steps of PFS levels 6 and 8 by adding a new salary step 11 in PFS level 7. The third eliminates all fractions of a cent in the results of payroll calculations. These changes are improvements which, taken together, yield a net saving of $12 million.

The most significant improvement in this bill, as compared with H.R. 8986, is a 25-percent reduction—from $10,000 down to $7,500—in the salary increases provided for Members of Congress, Federal judges, Cabinet officers, and immediate sub-Cabinet officers. These increases also will be postponed to January of 1965, whereas they would have been retroactive to January of 1964 under the earlier bill.

The total annual cost of the salary adjustments provided by H.R. 11049 will be $533 million, an amount which is $11 million less than the President's budget figure of $544 million. The President has sent me word that he considers this bill one of the three most urgently needed legislative measures that he has recommended to the 88th Congress, and has strongly emphasized his personal support of its prompt enactment. I earnestly hope that this important bill will receive the approval of the membership of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to commend the distinguished chairman of the great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I had the honor of serving on his committee when I first came to Congress. The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee has always been a very conscientious legislator giving consideration to the problems of Federal employees and of the taxpayers of the country. He is a great American, and I am happy that he is opening the debate on this bill. I commend the gentleman, and I commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], for his untiring efforts, and I commend all the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for bringing this bill to the House.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to join the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee and the Speaker of the House in urging again, as I urged when the salary bill was before the House previously, that the House unite in adopting this measure.

The gentleman's reference to the President of the United States brings to my mind the fact that the President has said repeatedly that getting and holding the type of men in responsible executive positions that he needs in this critical period and that any other President would need requires that this measure be adopted. The bill is budgeted and within the President's program.

I urge that the bill be passed without any crippling amendments.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the gentleman for his very kind remarks.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, the last time this bill came up I voted wholeheartedly in support of the legislation. I do want to agree with my colleague and good friend from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] when he said this is a deterioration of the process of representative government, when a bill is defeated and then later comes up in the same session to be voted on again. I think the timing of the bill last time might have been poorly arranged.

Nevertheless, I want to make this point. I have been in Congress for 12 years. The last time we had a pay increase, 1956, I supported not a $7,500 increase but a $10,000 or $12,000 increase. I think the American people, as I have explained to them in my own district, understand the expenses of Members of Congress. I cannot understand how our Members can exist and carry on their functions, maintain two homes, travel back and forth, and make all the multitudinous contributions expected of men in public office, unless they have a private business, as I happen to have had and maintained for the past 35 years.

I say to you, my colleagues, that irrespective of the material benefits to our public employees it is about time the Members of the House vote the courage of their convictions and say to their constituents, "This is a matter that is vitally necessary if you expect us to carry on the job with a clear conscience, knowing that we can pay our expenses as we go, knowing that every 2 years we will have to run for election, knowing that we must travel back and forth to the primaries and elections and travel back and forth to our districts to see our constituents, which is a vital part of our legislative duties."

I hope that today the Members of the House of Representatives will stand up and vote for this bill, that they will vote for their own pay increases. I am only sorry that they did not leave the $10,000 increase in the bill but reduced it to $7,500, because this is going to make little difference in the public mind.

I am sorry, too, we have not had the benefit of the news media through the years and today to let the American people know just what are the expenses of a Member of Congress. If the American people knew the expenses of a Member of Congress they would be amazed. There is not a Member of the House that I know of that can save a single dime out of his salary.

Let us remember this, that Members of Congress have to pay a large sum into their retirement funds. Many will not live, many will not be reelected, to benefit by that retirement payment. But our Judiciary do not pay a dollar into the retirement fund, they get their full salary while they live, and they do not have to be reelected and they do not have to maintain two homes.

So I say again to the Members of this House that I am going to be very happy to cast my vote for this bill, more particularly for the benefit of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and I hope the bill will be passed. It will not benefit me as I am retiring as you know.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I would like at the very beginning to clear up one thing that may not be clear in the minds of Members as to the amount of time spent in hearings and consideration of this legislation. I have been in the Congress for 22 years. I have been on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from the day that that committee was created under the Reorganization Act. There has been no bill or no important legislation before our committee since its inception that was more thoroughly debated, more thoroughly gone into, with all witnesses for and against having an opportunity to testify. No witness who wanted to appear before our committee on this legislation was refused an opportunity to be heard and we heard witnesses week in and week out. We heard over 50 witnesses—some for and some against. No legislation that our committee has ever considered was more fully gone into than this particular legislation. I realize that the hearings did not suit those perhaps who were and are opposed to this legislation, but when you consider that our committee voted this bill out by a vote of 14-to-3, and when you consider that the matter was thoroughly taken up and discussed on every point and every subject for 2 days before the whole House and I think that any further discussion of it in our committee would certainly have been a waste of time and would have accomplished no useful purpose.

I want to commend the distinguished chairman of our committee for his dedication, tolerance, and patience in granting everybody time to be heard and in granting all witnesses ample opportunity to give their views on this legislation. I think the time has come when you will soon vote whether you are for the bill or against it.

This bill does not differ too much from the bill which was recently taken up here before the House in March. The amount of $10,000 for executives' congressional and judicial salaries have been reduced to $7,500. The date that it will go into effect is January 1, 1965. No Member of the Congress is neces-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

sarily voting himself a pay raise because before he gets his pay raise, he will have to get elected to the Congress come next November and that applies also for Members of the other body, as well.

In the previous bill the classified and postal pay increases went into effect retroactively last January. That has been changed so that the classified and postal pay increases go into effect on the first pay day after the enactment of this legislation.

With a few other minor changes, that is just about the difference between the bill which was thoroughly discussed on the floor and the bill which is before us today.

I certainly urge each and every member of this Committee to consider the facts. Whereas we as Members of Congress have not had a pay raise since 1956, postal employees and classified employees have had something like 4 or 5 salary increases, of about 40 percent. Members, I am sure, realize that it may be 10 years or even 15 years before another congressional pay raise will ever come before this House for consideration again.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States in his letter of March 17, 1964, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and in many public statements since that time, urged in the strongest possible language the favorable consideration of legislation to increase pay levels of Government employees and officers.

The President stated in his letter of March 17 that every cent of the $533 million annual cost of the pay increases is included in the budget for fiscal year 1964. The President's letter is quoted in full on page 2 of our committee report and I urge each Member here today to reread that letter. I am sure most of us will agree with the urgency attending the consideration of this legislation. I am in favor of all possible economy in Government and likewise.

I support this determined drive for economy in the Government. In order to reach this goal of economy first-class managers are needed who can tighten organizations, simplify procedures, trim waste, and inspire maximum effort.

There is no question in my mind that it is false economy to offer salaries that will attract the mediocre and repel the talented. This false economy applies whether the low salaries are in the top executive levels or in the lower levels of our dedicated postal and other career employees.

Private industry, universities, and most local governments already have learned this lesson of false economy. It is now time for the Federal Government to recognize such policy of false economy and take corrective action as recommended in this legislation.

Salary adjustments for postal and other career employees under the comparability policy established by the Congress in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, Public Law 87-793, depend entirely on a just and equitable alinement of salaries for the top executives and for Members of Congress as urged by the Randall report as well as provided for in the Committee bill. Unless the compression on the top-level rates is removed, we cannot expect to be able to follow the principle of comparability for career employees.

This legislation is designed in the light of action taken by the House of Representatives in its consideration of H.R. 8986 last March. It is based on the conviction of the overwhelming majority of our committee that the Members of the House will consider favorably and approve legislation providing fair and equitable increases for officers and employees of the Federal Government and for Members of Congress.

The purposes and the principles of this legislation are identical to those of our earlier committee bill, H.R. 8986. There are differences, however, in some important technical aspects.

The amount of the increases is $7,500 instead of $10,000 for Members of Congress, Federal judges, and Cabinet and immediate sub-Cabinet officers. These increases will become effective in January 1965.

No salary rate for any officer or employee will be increased to a rate above $22,000 until January 1965.

The salary rates for officers of the House of Representatives are increased by amounts similar to increases for Classified Act employees. There are no special rates for these officers.

The rates of compensation of the members of regulatory boards and commissions are specifically fixed and are not subject to Presidential salary fixing authority.

The total annual cost of H.R. 11049 is approximately $533 million and is substantially below the cost of H.R. 8986 and below the amount of $544 million already included in the budget for fiscal year 1965.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11049 represents the first annual review of Government pay levels under the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. The 1962 act established a modern salary policy of comparability based on the principle that Federal career salaries should be comparable to the salaries paid workers in private enterprise for substantially equal levels of responsibility.

Title I of H.R. 11049 provides the first of the comparable salary increases for postal and other career employees as contemplated by the 1962 act.

I would like to emphasize that the comparability principle applies to career levels only. It does not apply and never was intended to apply to the executive or management levels above GS-15. Title I of this legislation represents a major step forward in providing salary rates for the four major statutory career salary systems reasonably comparable to the rate for substantially equal responsibilities in private enterprise. We recognize that current comparability is not obtained in the middle and higher career levels.

Full comparability at this time would skyrocket the annual cost of this bill to $900 million, far beyond the $544 million currently budgeted for the fiscal year 1965. The $533 cost of our bill was geared to stay well below the current budget figures.

Title I of the bill guarantees a minimum 3 percent salary increase for the postal and other career Federal employees in the lower grades. The maximum dollar increase will be $4,500 in the highest grade and levels. The average increase for the 375,000 letter carriers and postal clerks is $340 each or an increase of approximately 6.7 percent. Similar increases are provided for employees in other services who are in related grades or levels. Agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees will receive salary increases equal to those granted Classification Act employees in comparable grades and levels of responsibility.

Title I of the bill also includes the very important reformations recommended by the Postmaster General in the system of fixing salaries of postmasters. Postmasters at fourth-class offices will have their pay fixed in proportion to the annual salary rates of PFS level 5 in accordance with the relationship of their hours of duty to full time service. The bill will discard the archaic system of measuring salaries of postmasters in terms of the dollars of revenue received in their post offices. That system is completely outmoded and will be replaced under this bill by a new, realistic, and effective system which balances and gives proper weight to all factors entering into the conduct of post offices and the levels of duties and responsibilities of the postmasters.

Titles II, III, and IV of the bill include increases in the statutory salary levels for Members of Congress, Cabinet, and sub-Cabinet officers, Federal judges, and other officials in the legislative and judicial branches of the Government.

Titles II and IV also include salary adjustments for other legislative and judicial employees which are comparable in amount to the increases provided by title I for Classification Act employees. This conforms to the historic policy of our committee and of the House in adjusting rates of compensation for judicial and legislative employees, followed in 1955, 1958, 1960, and 1962.

Less than 1,500 offices and positions are concerned in the congressional, executive, and judicial salary provisions at the aggregate cost of only $12 million, slightly over 2 percent of the total cost of the bill. As I have indicated, the proposed salary increases for these highly responsible officers are the key to a sound, rational, and effective salary system, as well as the key to a sound, economical and efficient operation of our Government. Without the long-overdue salary modernization provided in this bill, management in the Government will be at a severe disadvantage in responding to the critical requirements of our national defense and other major public programs.

The reliance of postal and other career Federal employees on the Congress for fair salary treatment depends heavily in the final analysis on the levels of executive, judicial, and congressional salaries.

The points I have noted are those which I believe to be of paramount im-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

portance and concern so that the membership of the House will be fully informed as to the principles of our committee bill and of the necessity for its early enactment. I earnestly hope that this worthy legislation will receive approval of the House of Representatives here today. I urge favorable consideration of this bill.

(Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] a former member of the committee.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, nearly 2 million American citizens who have chosen to serve their Government look to us this afternoon to fulfill the promise and commitment we made to them in 1962 that, by so serving their Government, they should not be required to suffer economic discrimination. H.R. 11049 should be approved promptly. It has been delayed much too long.

The salary-fixing authority which is lodged here in the Congress is not always the most pleasant for us to discharge. For reasons that I have never been able to fully comprehend it seems that every time we legislate in the field of Federal salaries, or for that matter in the field of any beneficial employee legislation, we must continually travel down the thorny path of endless controversy.

Two years ago we thought we had found a solution to this recurring problem. We adopted here in this Chamber the very sound and enlightened policy that salaries paid to our Federal employees should be as comparable as possible to the salaries paid to employees in private industry for the same types of work. We discarded completely the old concept of adjusting Federal salaries pretty much in an amount corresponding to the degree of pressure exerted or on the basis of what the traffic would bear at the moment. Instead, we created the means and the machinery to adjust salaries in the future in an atmosphere of responsible deliberation and on a sound and orderly basis.

It is most regrettable, in my opinion, that on this first test of whether we will honor the promise and principle of comparability, we have not been able to do so without again getting bogged down in controversy. The principle of comparability is eminently fair and a most reasonable and rational approach to the salary-fixing problem. We should recognize that we now have a really workable system for assuring that our employees receive compensation commensurate with their duties and in accord with prevailing wage rates. The system does work and our principal responsibility now is to permit it to work.

I realize that this first test of the new system has been clouded by the politically sensitive problem of adjusting our own salaries. However, this too is a problem that we have to face head on. We must resolve it now, and when we do, I am hopeful and confident that future salary adjustments on the basis of comparability for our career employees will come about almost routinely.

I am sure that many of my colleagues would much prefer that they were not faced here today with a proposal that includes increases in their own salaries. Nevertheless, I must repeat that unless we change the law, our own salaries will not be raised unless we vote to do so. And it is vitally important that we do.

The provisions of this bill which call for upward adjustments in salaries for Members of Congress, Federal executives, and Federal judges are relatively insignificant, both as to the number and cost. Only 1,399 employees are involved in these provisions at a cost of $11.8 million, which is only 2.2 percent of the total cost of the measure. Nevertheless, in many respects these provisions are the most essential parts of this legislation.

We have got to adjust upward our own salaries and the salaries of Federal executives and judges for two compelling reasons.

First, and maybe least important, is the fact that they are needed and long overdue. The last pay increase for these officials was in 1955, during which period the salary rates for career employees have been increased an aggregate of 51 percent. The present salary rates for these officials are, by any set of standards, completely inadequate to their responsibilities and duties. I will not repeat the examples that you are probably now familiar with of the number of State and local officials, foundation officers, college presidents, corporation officials, and so on, throughout the country who are receiving appreciably much more in pay than are Cabinet officers and Members of Congress. Suffice it to say that any comparison of Federal executive salary schedules with private industry executive salary schedules borders on the absurd.

Second, and most probably most important, pay increases must be granted to Members of Congress and other Federal officials now, as part of this bill, if we are to maintain the proper and necessary distinctions and relationships between their rates of pay and those which career employees are receiving.

There now exists in the top grades of the statutory salary systems a compression that can only be relieved by lifting the ceiling which Federal executive pay and congressional pay impose on these salaries. For example, in the so-called supergrades, GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18, under the rates now in effect, a large number of these employees are receiving salaries less than subordinate employees in grades 14 and 15. Specifically, every employee in step 2 and above in grade 15 makes more money than an employee in step 1 of grade 16. An employee in step 8 of grade 15 makes more money than every employee in every step of grade 16 and more than every employee up through step 3 of grade 17. We now have the ridiculous situation existing where the managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals, for instance, are making less money than many of the doctors on their staffs.

It is simply not possible from a technical and mechanical point of view to do the proper job of adjusting Federal career salaries in the future, on the basis of comparability, while maintaining pay distinctions in keeping with degrees of responsibility and work levels, without at this time modernizing the existing inadequate salary structures for Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, and Federal judges.

Mr. Chairman, I am as sensitive as any Member to the fact that our economy is not as healthy as it should be and that we must put a halt to mounting governmental expenditures. I am proud of my own past record of voting to achieve economy and some semblance of fiscal responsibility in the operation of our Federal Government. However, I cannot subscribe to the theory that economy can be achieved in Government at the expense of paying substandard salaries to the officers and employees upon whom we must depend for economical management. I agree with President Johnson that in order to achieve economy in Government we need first-class managers—"who can tighten organizations, simplify procedures, trim waste, and inspire maximum effort." And I further agree that economy cannot be achieved by offering salaries that attract the mediocre and repel the talented.

If one argues that higher salaries automatically result in higher costs, one must logically conclude that all private enterprise costs are excessive because of the much higher salary levels to be found in private enterprise. But we all know that this is not true. Private businesses pay at high salary levels in order to obtain the highest possible level of competence. The higher salary averages in private industry today are the absolute proof that these are the salary levels at which American business leaders believe they can best fulfill their basic goals of profit and product. I can certainly assure you that few, if any, private companies would be so foolish as to advocate adopting our present Federal salary levels in the name of economy.

If a company engaged in business for profit can realize a profit while paying salaries appreciably higher than the Federal Government pays, it is completely illogical to assume that this richest and most powerful Government in the world cannot afford to begin paying its own employees salaries more comparable to those paid by profitmaking companies.

Let us be realistic and practical in our economizing. Let us stop, before they even get started, a few of these new spending proposals of questionable merit. In the spending of our public funds let us establish some type of priority so that no spending program shall have precedence over our need to secure and retain in the Government service the best qualified people that can be found in our country. We will be a richer and stronger Nation for doing so.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

(Mr. DANIELS asked and was given permission to revise and extend this remarks.)

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly join my colleagues in urging prompt and favorable consideration of H.R. 11049.

I would like to emphasize that this bill is before you at this time for only one reason—it is the fulfillment of the commitment of Congress, made to Federal employees in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, that their salaries should be a comparable as possible to the salaries paid to employees in private industry for the same levels of work and responsibility.

For 95 percent of the Federal employees covered in this bill—the so-called rank-and-file career employees covered by the Classification Act and in the Postal Field Service—average percentage salary increases of 4.3 percent and 5.6 percent, respectively, are provided. Up to date 1963 comparability is achieved in the bill for employees in the lower grades and it is not quite achieved for the employees in the middle and upper grades. Comparability in the higher grades has been deliberately delayed in order to keep the total cost of this measure under the President's budget recommendations.

Upward salary adjustments are also provided in this measure for Members of Congress, Federal executives, and Federal judges for two very simple reasons:

First, they are needed and long overdue. The last pay raise for these officials was in 1955, during which period the salary rates for career employees have been adjusted upward an aggregate of 51 percent.

Second. The salaries of Members and Federal officials must be adjusted upward in order to maintain the proper and necessary distinctions between their rates of pay and those which career employees are receiving.

Mr. Chairman, the argument heard most against this bill is its cost. It appears for some reason that the red flag of cost is consistently waved in the path of any measure that comes before the Congress that is designed to increase the pay or otherwise make the working conditions of our employees just a little more attractive. It seems that we can always find funds in the vast resources of the Federal Treasury to subsidize the wheat growers, the feed grain farmers, the cotton industry, and just about anyone who wants to get in line. There is, indeed, something wrong about a situation whereby the Congress can consistently vote vast sums of money for all these subsidies and for all types of new spending programs, yet the loudest cries of cost seem to be raised over a bill which seeks only to pay a decent wage to the employees charged with administering of these subsidies and new programs.

The $533 million cost of H.R. 11049 is $135 million less than the cost of the earlier pay bill, H.R. 8986, as it was reported from our committee. It is $1½ million less than the President has budgeted for fiscal year 1965. And, incidentally, Mr. Chairman, from my research into the subject, I am unable to find any record at all of a situation existing before as we now have of the money actually being budgeted and available prior to the enactment of a Federal employees' salary bill.

Nevertheless, I firmly believe that the cost of this bill, regardless of what it might be, must be considered in light of the fact that the Government has an obligation to pay its employees wages comparable to those being paid by private companies. The fact that the Government spends more than it takes in in revenue does not relieve it from this obligation, no more than a private company, that may be operating at a loss, is relieved from its obligation of paying its employees prevailing wage rates. There are not many bills that come before this Congress, the cost of which are as fully justified as are the costs of this measure. The costs involved in H.R. 11049 are an investment in human beings—an investment designed to enable the Federal Government to recruit and retain the highest quality in personnel and to enable it to operate more efficiently and economically.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely urge your favorable consideration of H.R. 11049.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to put in proper perspective the lack of proper committee consideration of this pending bill. Let me at the outset point out that on Thursday, April 9, 1964, the full Post Office and Civil Service Committee met in executive session and a motion was made and seconded to take up H.R. 10700 and other related salary bills and to meet every Thursday until the committee had disposed of the legislation.

After adopting that motion, the committee proceeded to consideration of other matters. There was no discussion of the revised provisions of that pay bill, H.R. 10700. Seven days later, on Thursday, April 16, an open hearing was held and there was discussion of H.R. 319 to protect postal patrons from obscene mail. There was no discussion of pay legislation. Seven days later, on Thursday, April 23, the committee considered three bills and again there was no discussion of pay legislation.

On Thursday, April 30, again 7 days later, the committee convened at 10:35 a.m. and a motion was made and adopted to consider H.R. 11049 with all debate to end at 11:20 a.m. That motion was adopted and H.R. 11049 favorably reported, without amendment, and then of course sent to the Rules Committee.

There has been not one word of hearings or testimony on the pending bill, H.R. 11049. The proponents of this measure can slice their explanations thick or thin and the end result will be the same.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the enactment of H.R. 11049 just as vigorously and completely as I opposed the earlier pay increase bill, H.R. 8986, which was defeated by a rollcall vote of 222 to 184, and I trust a sufficient number of the Members of the House will again stand to be counted when the demand is made for the rollcall vote.

I would hope that the leadership on both sides of the aisle would, on this occasion, lend their full support to a rollcall on final passage.

This new bill is virtually identical to the earlier version. There is nothing to warrant a June reversal of the wise and responsible action of last March. As a matter of cold, hard fact the Nation has plunged still further in debt since that time.

Passage of this bill at this time in the face of overwhelming evidence that it is inimical to the national welfare, and opposed by most American citizens, would be an act of "midsummer madness."

We must again today pursue a reasonable course of action and we must, in good conscience, reject H.R. 11049 just as decisively as we rejected the previous salary grab.

I have heard of no taxpayer mass meetings—no demonstrations in the streets of any city, village or hamlet, North, East, West, or South—importuning Congress to schedule a repeat performance of this extravaganza.

Let me review briefly a few of the weird and improbable backdrops before which you are again being asked to vote yourself a pay raise, or, as one colleague appropriately expressed it, "again having our feet put to the fire."

It is proposed here today that we raise our own salaries shortly after we have reduced the revenues of the Federal Government by $11.5 billion in individual and corporate income taxes and while the stage is being readied for a vote next week to increase the ceiling on the national debt to $324 billion.

In the midst of an alleged economy drive, you are being asked to add an additional one-half billion dollars annually to governmental payroll costs that must be paid for from borrowed money.

During a period when President Johnson has been urging business and labor leaders to exercise "restraint and responsibility" so that prices and wages will remain stable, it is actually being proposed that we today start an upward spiral of wages and prices.

We are being asked to grant salary increases effective immediately to Federal employees who have already had their salaries increased automatically as recently as last January 1.

We are being asked here today, within 5 months after one salary increase, to grant what will be the third salary increase in 19 months for these same employees with a total price tag that adds over $1.5 billion annually—an increase of 11 percent—to total Federal payroll costs in the 19 months' period.

In the name of comparability, we are being asked to enact a measure that admittedly does not achieve comparability.

On the claim of urgent need we are being pressured to vote today to increase our own salaries and the salaries of Federal executives and judges by 33⅓ percent, yet these increases would not take effect until next year.

We are asked to make the vast resources of the Federal Treasury avail-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

able for the payment salaries to officials of the District of Columbia government much higher than our own cities and States can afford to pay to their officials.

As strange and as weird as anything else, we are being asked to vote today on a bill on which no hearings were ever held by the responsible committee of the House; upon a bill that was favorably reported by that committee only 2 days after being introduced, with only 30 minutes' time allowed for the offering of amendments and for what should have been a full and complete discussion of a measure that contains five titles, 78 pages, and which proposes to change the salary rates for almost 2 million Federal employees.

And, just as fantastic, even though a rule was granted on this bill 3 weeks ago, we have only now come to the moment of truth by a last minute scheduling of this performance which we are told could not be scheduled earlier in the regular manner because time was needed to see if the same show would "go on the road" in the other Chamber.

Certainly, in view of these improbable and even preposterous settings, the spectacle we are projecting to the American people is a sad one, and I implore Members of the House to consider their decision most carefully.

Mr. Chairman, I am firmly convinced that this bill is again ill timed, unwarranted, expensive, and contrary to sound reasoning and responsibility. My own views in detail on the measure and those of some of my colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee are expressed on page 127 of the committee's report. These reports are available here and I earnestly hope that the Members will carefully read these minority views before they decide how they will cast their votes. There are other compelling reasons why this legislation should be defeated.

One of the greatest dangers we now face in this Nation—one that has the potential for destroying us—is the pressures that may be unleashed for a renewal of the price-wage spiral and a vicious inflationary cycle. The President claims to recognize this danger.

In his Economic Report to the Congress in January of 1964, the President called particular attention to the urgent necessity for avoiding inflationary wage increases. He said that he would keep close watch on price and wage developments and that he would not hesitate to, and I quote, "draw public attention to major actions by either business or labor that flout the public interest," unquote. In inflationary price-wage practices.

In Atlantic City on March 23 the President had this to say:

> We must not choke off our needed and speedy economic expansion by a revival of the price-wage spiraling. Avoiding that spiral is the responsibility of business, and it is also the responsibility of labor.

I submit to the Members of this House that this business is also the responsibility of the Congress, and in view of the apparent inconsistent attitude and the impotence of the administration this responsibility for maintaining stability on wages and prices will only be fully discharged if the Congress now assumes the badly needed leadership.

The Congress must now set an example for the private sector of our economy by holding the line on wage costs. Congress must reject the concept that precipitous and unwarranted pay increases can be granted without unleashing ruinous inflation. The economy simply cannot afford the luxury of this bill at this time. Even the loosest standard of fiscal decency is flaunted by the spectacle of a Member of Congress voting to reduce Government income by $11.5 billion, voting himself a sizable pay raise, and then voting to raise the national debt limit so that the money can be borrowed to meet his own increased payroll.

Congress is often described as a board of directors and the voters and taxpayers as stockholders of the corporation. It is not necessary to draw on the imagination to know what the stockholders of a private corporation would do, if, with the corporation deeply in debt, the directors voted themselves lavish salary increases. At the first annual meeting, preferably on a cold day in November, the directors would be given one-way tickets to that land where the woodbine twineth and the whangdoodle whangeth.

And let me say at this point I find it incredible that President Johnson, who has been gallivanting over the country exploring "pockets of poverty," would use the power and pressure of his office to demand that Congress vote itself a $7,500, perhaps a $10,000, a year salary increase.

This is the same President Johnson who, in taking over the office of Chief Executive, said he would always respect the independence and integrity of Congress. Yet in recent days his henchmen have been prowling the corridors on Capitol Hill and keeping the telephones hot in behalf of this bill. Is it possible that Capitol Hill has been secretly designated as a "pocket of poverty"?

There is also another serious and disturbing aspect to this legislation which has not received sufficient attention but of itself it is certainly sufficient cause for the rejection of this bill. It is the dangerous threat that enactment of this bill will have upon the civil service employees' retirement fund.

This fund, which is the hope and future of the people who work for the Federal Government, currently shows an actuarial deficit estimated at $34 billion and the fund is going further in the red at a rate of $1.5 billion each year solely on the basis of the Government's failure to pay interest on the deficit.

It is estimated that unless action is taken to correct the situation, the fund will be completely wiped out by the year 1989 and for each year thereafter we will have to directly appropriate between $2 and $3 billion to provide the retirement benefits to our people that we have committed ourselves to.

The two pay increases that were provided for in Public Law 793 of the 87th Congress in themselves increased the deficiency in the civil service retirement fund by $3 billion. And the Civil Service Commission now estimates that enactment of H.R. 11049 will add another $1.25 billion to this deficiency. This bill, by blithely providing for salary increases, ranging up to 33⅓ percent for Federal employees, ignores completely the fact that by so doing it jeopardizes the economic future of these employees. There eventually must be a day of reckoning—a day when we will have to face up to the fringe effects of these salary enactments—and when that day comes, it will not be a pleasant one for the Congress or for the American taxpayer.

I have here a letter which I received and which I understand was sent to every member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee from Vaux Owen, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees. This is one of the largest of the national unions of Federal employees; it is most effective and was founded in 1917. Its membership is exclusively confined to those who work for the Federal Government and the members of this union are intended to be among the beneficiaries of this legislation. You would assume that they would have a selfish and a most active interest in its prompt enactment.

However, in this letter the president of the union deplores the fact that no hearings were held on H.R. 11049 and that he had no opportunity to testify before the committee. He has seen fit to send to me and, I presume, to the other members of the committee a copy of the statement which he would have made on the legislation if hearings had been held, and in his letter he characterizes H.R. 11049 as "a monstrous distortion of the comparability principle and an unjustified departure from the rule prescribed by the Congress for implementing that policy."

I have read Mr. Owens' statement, as he has asked me to, and I assure you that he raises a number of disturbing questions with respect to H.R. 11049 that probably will never be answered nor resolved. It is certainly no credit to this bill that it was permitted to come before the House under a gag procedure that deprived the Members of this body the committee consideration that is essential to legislating responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, since the majority of employees covered in this bill have already received a salary increase last January, since salary increases proposed for most of the other employees will not take effect until next year, and since too many vital questions have been raised and unanswered by legislation of this magnitude, I sincerely urge that this bill be rejected.

I am certain that if we reject this bill today; if we, by example, show business and labor that we mean it when we say "hold the line on wages and prices"; if we here take the leadership in giving our ailing economy a massive dose of "restraint and responsibility," our action will meet with the full approval of the people we here serve.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I think it is well pointed out time and again in the discussions on this legislation that Congress has the sole responsibility in the area of salaries. This is where the buck stops; right here on the question of salaries. Therefore, it follows that we are largely responsible for the effectiveness and the ability of our Government itself to function well and to perform for the people of these United States.

In the words of our President Johnson, he says:

> Every cent for these increases is already included in my budget for fiscal year 1965. The smallest budget in proportion to our national output since 1951.

In that letter from which I quoted, the President of the United States says for him as leader of the country to get one dollar's worth of performance for every dollar spent, he needs this pay bill.

Now what is the problem? The problem is that we compete with private industry, with public institutions, with the whole economy of the country in getting the kind of talent that is necessary to operate this biggest industry, this biggest part of our whole system, our Federal Government.

To do that our Government must recruit 400,000 "new faces" every year.

Even though in the Government the employment has reduced some 9 percent in the years 1946 to 1963, despite the reduction in the number of employees there is a turnover in employment in the Federal Government of 400,000 people per year.

We must attract leadership in such fields as space flight and all the new sciences of space. We must attract the best kind of talent in agriculture, as well, and in every field of endeavor in this country. We must have the best kind of talent in the Federal Government because, whether a department of the Federal Government is functioning as a leader in any particular field or not, the Government is participating in every field with talent of the country, and certainly the talent of the Government must be equal to the leadership of any other part of our economy.

In regard to improving crops in agriculture and improving livestock in the field of agriculture, the Federal Government has furnished a substantial part of the leadership. Congress has appropriated the money to attract this leadership. In that field there is a great deal of activity in the private economy, and the private economy is competing with the Government and the Government competing with the private economy in the attracting of this talent.

The Federal Government as an employer must be competitive in—the word is now—the mainstream of our economy. Attracting needed talent is necessary.

One of the really tragic examples of our failure to do this is our friend Mr. Walter Williams, who was the leader in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in charge of the program for space flights. The top salary the Government could pay Mr. Williams was $20,000 a year, under law. He has resigned. We know that he went to employment in private industry at a salary at least twice the $20,000 offered by the Government. By a coincidence, he will be working for an industry which in turn is employed by the Federal Government in this great program.

There are numerous other examples of lawyers, economists, engineers, and scientists who leave Federal employment and go to private industry at salaries twice as great as those offered in Government.

Also, in the Post Office Department, we are finding that outstanding letter carriers and outstanding postal clerks, who should become the leadership in the Post Office Department—perhaps late this year, and certainly in the coming years—are leaving Federal employment. We will be looking for leadership in that Department and we will not have it, because we are not hanging on to the people in the Post Office Department who should become the leaders.

To solve this problem, in 1962 the Congress adopted the principle of comparability by passage of the pay bill that year. The principle of comparability is operated by requesting the Bureau of Labor Statistics to report the comparable pay in private industry for those same talents as are hired in the Federal Government. We are informed by report on the amount of money paid per hour for talents in industry comparable to those hired in the Government. We are also advised of the percentage of increase experienced by the employee in industry. We are advised that the percentage of increase has been about 3 percent a year. In the general classification of employees in the general services and in the Post Office Department, up to about the pay of $6,000 a year, we have experienced a timelag of 1 to 2 years in meeting competition or in maintaining comparable pay in the Federal Government with that of private industry. In the higher grades, we have had longer periods of timelag, and in the highest grades, that of $20,000 a year or more, there has been no increase since 1955.

The fact of the matter is that the salary paid Congressmen—$22,500 a year—is a ceiling on all the higher grades—indeed, it is a ceiling on the scientists, the lawyers, the economists, the engineers, and specialists of all kinds. Yes, the Congressman's salary is even a ceiling on all the Cabinet and all of the judiciary. In that regard, let me say that it is fair to generalize that the lobbyist representing industry at the Congress, the lawyer representing his client in the courts, and the businessman representing his business in the executive branch of the Government are all being paid several times more than the salary of the Congressman, the jurist, or the executive Federal employee.

We have labored hard to bring to you the report that was filed supporting this bill. We heard 45 witnesses in 10 full days of hearings. Not a single witness appeared against the bill. It is supported by the American Bar Association, by engineering societies, by the scientists, by businessmen; and leading newspapers all over the country are calling for Congress to pass this bill as an act supporting responsible government. Yes, the act is timely. It is even late. It is tardy. It is not inflationary. It is not inflationary because the employees, the leadership of the Federal Government are all productive. Their productivity is comparable to the best in our country. They are lagging behind the pay of private industry, and in that lag, the salaries of Federal employees and leadership are actually deflationary. By our figures from the printed hearings on this bill, the States, the counties, the universities, the public institutions, and private industry have a host of examples of salaries far higher than any in the Federal Government; particularly private industry discloses the board of directors of even small corporations—yes, small corporations of my own State of Montana, being paid far higher salaries than are paid our judges, our executive officers, and our Congress. We must lift this ceiling on salaries in the Federal Establishment to help our President attract the kind of talent necessary to continue the effectiveness necessary to the proper performance of our Government for our people.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I shall yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER], a member of the committee, but first I yield myself 1 minute.

I point out, in advance of the gentleman's remarks, that he has been one of the finest, most dedicated, and distinguished members of our committee. He will be a hard man to replace next year. We can be certain that what he will have to tell us today will be spoken with sincerity and could not possibly be attributed to any advantage to himself.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman from New Jersey and I have not seen eye to eye on every issue. We probably will not on this issue today. However, I join with my good friend the distinguished minority leader of the committee in expressing my regret that the gentleman is leaving the Congress and leaving the committee, and wish him well.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to seize this opportunity to join in a tribute to a great public servant. The gentleman from New Jersey is one of the finest men who ever served in Congress, as far as my own experience is concerned. I think I speak for all the Democratic members of the committee in paying tribute to the distinguished Member. He is a real gentleman. He is conscientious and works hard. I think it is a great loss to the Congress and the country that he is retiring from this body.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. I, too, would like to join in this tribute. My colleague from New Jersey came to the House at the same

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

time as did I. I have found him to be a gentleman in every sense of the word and truly dedicated to his task here. His effort today merely reflects his deep interest in his country and his unselfish approach to his responsibilities. I, too, regret he is to retire at the end of the session so that the Nation will not have the benefit of his counsel and his help in this Chamber in the days ahead.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I believe, in view of the facts that have just been brought out, we had better yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey if he is able to speak.

(Mr. WALLHAUSER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to express my appreciation for the kind words that have been spoken, and I hope I am still able to say something about the bill after this wonderful experience.

I would like to start off by saying that, of course, I support H.R. 11049 completely. Then I would like to say it has been a rare privilege and a great honor for me to have served on this great committee. I especially want to thank the chairman and the ranking minority member for their fair and just treatment at all times. I guess I will have to admit publicly, much as I hate to, that every member of the committee has more intelligence than I have and more ability to understand legislation than I have. Yet I think I was able to understand H.R. 11049 after we had considered the previous legislation at great length in days and days and days of hearings and after full explanation. So I feel that every member of this committee, and I think every Member of this House, surely must understand what is before us today. A previous speaker has mentioned that this legislation is virtually identical with the previous legislation, and it is. There are, of course, some differences in arithmetic, but they are not too serious and not too hard for us to understand what they are.

If we look upon our duty today, I think it is a very simple one, but we have a very heavy responsibility. I believe that we are in the same position as directors of a corporation who have to approve, or disapprove, or alter, the recommendations of the Executive. That is what we are doing today. We are passing upon the judgment of the executive department and we are altering it. We are altering it in this legislation.

Now I would like to go back to the Salary Reform Act of 1962 and point out two major accomplishments which were made in that legislation. First of all, we raised, in two steps, up to the 1961 comparability the pay and salaries of classified and postal workers. It did not reach 1962 comparability. Also it gave us the mechanics and specified by law as to what we are to do in the future to implement this legislation. Now that Public Law 87–793 is on the books it is our obligation to live up to the obligation that we assumed and vote according to the mandate given to us by that law.

I would like to point this out also: Federal employees are not allowed to strike against the Federal Government. Therefore, they must meet us at the bargaining table. This House of Representatives is the bargaining table at which labor and management are meeting today. We have to be fair in this situation. We have to understand their problems, and I think we must, with good judgment, and recognizing the taxpayers' interest, meet their reasonable demands, as reasonable men and women should.

Title I takes care to some degree the salary problems of 1.7 million very loyal employees.

For example, there are 375,000 postal employees who will receive only a minimum of, I think it is, $375 per annum increase. And yet if we look back over the last 15 years we will find that the classified employees have received 4.1-percent average increase and the postal workers 4.9-percent increase. This bill only calls for a 3-percent increase for them.

Mr. Chairman, if you will now look at the other side of the coin you will find that perhaps in the future years we will be giving lesser increases than we have in past years. That is a future probability.

Titles II, III, and IV take care of the legislative, executive, and judicial salary increases. There are only about 1,500 positions with $12 million per annum involved. It is not a very large sum as compared with the total amount in the bill of $533 million.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a moment to call your attention to the Randall report which has not been mentioned here today. The report of the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Reforms was issued on June 12, 1963. There were 10 very distinguished members of this Commission: Clarence R. Randall; John J. Corson, professor at Princeton; Marion B. Folsom, Eastman Kodak Co. and a former Cabinet officer; Theodore U. Houser, former top executive, Sears & Roebuck; Robert R. Lovett, Brown Bros., Harriman, former Secretary of the Army; George Meany, AFL–CIO; Don K. Price, Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard; Robert Ramspeck, former Member of Congress from Georgia; Stanley F. Reed, Associate Justice, retired, Supreme Court; Sydney Stein, Jr., Stein, Roe & Farnham, lawyer.

Mr. Chairman, they came in with these recommendations: that the Speaker and the Vice President should receive $60,000 a year; that Members of Congress should receive $35,000; Cabinet officers, $50,000; the Chief Justice, $60,500; and Associate Justices, $60,000; judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals, $45,000; and district court judges, $35,000.

Our legislation does not reach these figures by a good, long shot.

Mr. Chairman, these people had very good research facilities. They did a magnificent job. Their report was based on a sound foundation of facts plus excellent judgment by men who have been through various aspects of our economy and know the answers.

Of course, anyone seeking Federal employment recognizes that the element of prestige is important and desirable and the desire for public service is commendable. But we have to recognize that those Federal employees in the executive department are not allowed to have other gainful employment. They are limited to their Government compensation.

I claim that in order to attract, and finally to hold, competent employees, we have to pay salaries commensurate with their responsibilities and salaries comparable to those paid in private enterprise.

The figures will show—and this is only a partial list—that more than 1,000 governmental employees throughout the country, outside of the Federal Government—mayors, Governors, superintendents of schools, and so forth—receive more than $25,000 a year.

You have heard a lot about the subject of inflation. This is not a problem in this case because inflation only occurs, or can occur, when a disproportionate and a relatively sharp and sudden increase in the quantity of money or credit, or both, relative to goods available for purchase, occurs. There is no sudden or disproportionate increase here because this amount is budgeted and the Government, of course, will receive back large amounts in taxes. So that it will not all be outgo.

We have also heard a lot about unfunded liability. Of course, this is a problem. But it is only a real problem if everyone were to retire at once, so far as the deficiency is concerned. And there is a bill now before our committee which would, if enacted, make the fund self-supporting. Funds can be appropriated or the Government could make interest payments to take care of this problem.

We also hear about the increase in the debt ceiling bill which will be called up next week.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the members of the committee to these facts. The total amount of this bill is in the budget. So, we are not raising the ceiling because of this bill. Also, that Federal employment has gone down sharply in the last year. If the levels that were forecast in the 1964 budget were held to we would now have 73,000 more employees than we now have.

Further, I would say this: If you want to keep from raising the debt ceiling, stop appropriating money for new programs. Do not take it away from people, because you cannot run a business without good people. This, I believe, is fundamental and elementary.

Mr. Chairman, as far as this legislation is concerned the president of a concern in the private sector of our economy knows that if his competitor is paying certain salaries higher than he is, he has to meet those salaries or go out of business, or obtain inferior help.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close by saying this——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, we are the directors of the largest and

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

the most important corporation in the world. We have a heavy responsibility. Our duties are full time. Everyone of the Members of this House, except the Member in the well, is a capable individual. You can be replaced by the stockholders of your corporation, if they so desire, because you have to run for election every 2 years. The directors of a corporation have every right in the world to raise their fees and to raise the salaries of their employees, and that is what you are being asked to do. You are not being asked to do anything unusual or reprehensible. You are only being asked to be fair to those employees who cannot by any other means receive increases. I submit that you and I will not be living up to our full responsibility and in fact we will be actually shirking our duty if we do not pass H.R. 11049. I sincerely hope that we will.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL].

(Mr. POOL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no reason why we should not approve this legislation today. Every feature which some Members found objectionable in the first pay bill has been removed or altered to a point where objections are really no longer valid. The salary increases for Members of Congress, Federal judges, Cabinet officers, and sub-Cabinet officers have been dropped from $10,000 a year to $7,500 a year. They are also being deferred until January 1965. This means that no Member of this body can with any justification be accused of voting to give himself a pay increase. He will be voting to give the office an increase, and this is quite a different matter.

Mr. Chairman, a candidate for Congress may make political objections against pay raises on an individual basis, but he surely can have no valid objections against raising the prestige and the recompense for the job itself.

Mr. Chairman, I have just returned from Texas and I have talked to people in all of the counties practically throughout the State. In the district which it is my honor to represent, I represent the largest constituency of any Member here in the House of Representatives. Everyone to whom I talked said this about the pay raise: They wondered why the Federal Government could not pay the Federal judges, the Members of Congress, and the Cabinet officers decent wages and get better people to serve in these positions. They felt that this was just good commonsense, as all businesses in the United States follow this principle. You only get what you pay for. We will get better work and better people if we pay a decent salary.

Mr. Chairman, the testimony before the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service of which I am a member showed that comparable wages were lower in the Federal service than they are in industry.

Therefore I voted for the bill before in the House, and I intend to support this bill here today. If we are going to get qualified personnel to work for the Government we must pay salaries comparable to those paid by industry.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the committee.

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill, H.R. 11049.

Mr. Chairman, the Johnson administration has three antipoverty packages it insists that Congress approve this session. We take up the first of these today.

Especially, since this is the second attempt this year to provide relief from poverty for Members of Congress and top salary executive and judicial personnel, it occurs to me that we should view this bill in relation to the other two pending antipoverty proposals.

It is my understanding that the second of these measures is slated for consideration in the House next week. It is commonly and technically referred to as the debt ceiling increase bill.

This debt limit legislation is directed to a bona fide hardship case. With a present national debt of $308.7 billion, with an $8.8 billion deficit for the fiscal year ending the 30th of this month, and with an estimated deficit of $5.8 billion for the next fiscal year, it is obvious that Uncle Sam himself has his own poverty problem. Presumably, the Congress will again come to his rescue by raising the national debt limit to $324 billion—the sixth such increase, if memory serves me right, in less than 4 years.

Incidentally, let me say that if the pending half-billion-dollar pay raise is voted into law, it will be a half-billion-dollar contribution to the fiscal 1965 deficit and an equal contribution to the argument we will hear next week as to the necessity for raising the debt ceiling. The claim that this half-billion-dollar item is covered in the President's budget is neither here nor there. The hard fact remains that we are voting to spend money we do not have if we pass this bill today, and it will be nonetheless true if we pass the bill without a record vote.

The administration's third antipoverty program, of course, is the one designed for the poorer poor people. That is the one counted on by the administration to garner the real harvest of votes next November. That is the one designed to help the voters forget what we may do here today. That is the one designed to help them forget that, under the administration and House leadership's order of priorities, we took care of the impoverished Congressmen and bureaucrats first.

To be sure, under this bill, if enacted into law, we will grant some justifiable and justified pay raises. I can't conceive of Federal pay increases aggregating over $1.5 billion in 20 months without some meritorious benefits accruing therefrom. I wish it were possible for me to vote for those warranted pay raises. But the sort of something-for-everybody package we have here today makes it impossible for me to do so in good conscience.

There are a number of observations which I should like to make in my limited time both about the bill and about the general situation in which we find ourselves.

Let me, first of all, offer a word of caution to my colleagues.

Any Member of this House who thinks that the curse of adverse editorial and public comment about raising our own pay has now been removed had better think again.

It is true that this bill cuts $2,500 off the proposed pay raise for Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, and other top executive and judicial personnel. But we are still providing these top level Federal employees—including ourselves—with a 33⅓-percent pay raise. We are doing it a week before we again raise the debt ceiling—in itself an interesting commentary on the quality of the fiscal stewardship of this administration and a majority of this Congress.

I see no evidence that there is any less reluctance on the part of a majority of my colleagues so far as a roll call vote is concerned. This in itself is proof of a self-conscious embarrassment over what is proposed to be done.

But a new feature is added to our second consideration of this pay bill in less than 3 months. My good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] yesterday sent all of us a letter in which he apologized for the fact that the proposed increases for Members of Congress and other top level executive and judicial personnel "are inadequate," but he did not stop with that. He announced his intention to offer an amendment which would provide:

> That whenever classified or postal salaries are increased hereafter, such legislation will automatically increase executive, congressional and judicial salaries.

I will not discuss his formula for such automatic increases at this point.

In this same communication, the gentleman from Arizona stated that:

> Congress has already established machinery for regular annual adjustments in the classified and postal salary system.

These two statements considered together add up to one simple, bald, brazen proposed—the proposal to give Members of Congress a permanent personal vested interest in annual pay raises for Federal personnel. It is a proposal that Congress adopt a policy in perpetuity of annual automatic pay adjustments—a euphemism for pay increases—for Members of Congress and other top Federal officials. This is an antipoverty program with a vengeance.

I have read, with great interest, the compilation of editorial comments on our March 12 action which was placed in the RECORD by my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] and which he thoughtfully circulated among Members of this House. I note that one of these editorials, from the Milwaukee Journal, bore the title, "Sneaky, then Cowardly." I suggest that this will stand as high praise of the Congress in comparison to what will be said editorially if we adopt the Udall proposal for automatic pay raises for Members of Congress

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

and then pass that bill without a rollcall vote.

No wonder there are serious misgivings about having a record vote on this legislation. Just how much punishment do some of my colleagues think the American taxpayers are willing to take?

Turning to another aspect of this matter, I should like to comment briefly on one or two statements made by the President of the United States in his letter of March 17 to the Speaker of the House urging the House to reconsider and approve pay raise legislation. In some respects, this is the most amazing message ever addressed to this House by a President.

In times past, I have been severely critical of a statement made by Mr. Clarence B. Randall, then Chairman of the President's Federal Salary Policy Committee. In this statement, Mr. Randall said:

I am firmly convinced that higher Federal salaries would attract a level of competence that would so improve government operations that there would be no out-of-pocket costs at all.

Heretofore, I had thought this was the ultimate in hyperbole. I was wrong.

In his March 17 message, the President said:

The dollars paid to attract brains and ability to the Federal service will come back to the American people many times over in more economical and effective government.

I am intrigued also by another interesting display of logic in the President's message.

In listing the alleged adverse effects of nonenactment of the pay raise, the President cited the following as one deplorable consequence. Such failure, he said, would:

Jeopardize increases in military pay, which I have recommended to keep Armed Forces pay generally in line with nonmilitary salaries.

Now, if I understand the argument advanced by the President, it is to the effect that we must raise nonmilitary salaries of civilian Federal employees in order to make it possible for the administration to secure increases in military pay which will keep that pay in line with the nonmilitary pay. I would not presume to guess who drafted that masterpiece of illogic for the President of the United States. But there it is.

In terms of the old familiar phrase, the way to "keep up with the Joneses" is to see to it that the Joneses step up their own standard of living and spending. Antipoverty—it is wonderful.

My final comment at this point in the debate regarding this revised Federal pay bill goes to the matter of the much-discussed "comparability principle."

Let me preface this comment by reminding the House, as some of my colleagues have already done, and as the minority views which I signed, emphasize, this revised bill was voted out of committee without so much as 5 minutes of hearings. Even the scheduled appearance of the Director of the Budget and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission before an executive session of the committee was vetoed by the White House—an act of almost unprecedented executive ruthlessness. This amounts to telling this House that it must pass this bill, not on its merits, but on the President's insistence. I am reminded of the popular song, "What Lola Wants, Lola Gets." We shall see. And we shall also see how the American people react to these tactics.

The fact is that this bill reduces the price tag of this proposed pay raise from $668,500,000 to $533,200,000.

The committee report on H.R. 8986—the pay bill defeated last March—made a big point over the fact that it involved an annual cost of $381 million less than the first proposal taken up by the committee for action last fall. Presumably, this first proposal was based on the principle of comparability. During the debate last March, I observed that comparability must indeed be a most elastic principle if this much of a reduction could be made without impairing that all-important principle. Today's bill has a price tag of $135 million below the March bill.

Thus, we find that in a period of less than 9 months, the proposed cost of a pay bill supposedly based on the highly scientific concept of comparability has been reduced more than one-half billion dollars—and we are supposed to believe that the principle of comparability was adhered to in each of these three proposals and that it today stands unimpaired in this half-billion-dollar-cheaper pay raise proposal. Who, I might ask, is kidding whom?

I will say this. One of the gentlemen who is not being deceived is Mr. Vaux Owen, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees.

Mr. Owen wrote me under date of June 4, as I presume he did other members of the committee. He pointed out that the original committee hearings last year were held on H.R. 7552, a bill which the administration strongly supported. In Mr. Owen's judgment, "the principle of comparability was fairly and reasonably adhered to" in this bill.

Commenting on the bill H.R. 11049, which we are considering today, Mr. Owen said:

This is a monstrous distortion of the comparability policy and an unjustified departure from the rule prescribed by the Congress for implementing that policy.

The simple truth, of course, is that it is farcical to talk about the comparability principle in connection with this bill or in connection with the legislative procedure which the committee has followed since last fall.

The governing principle in today's proposal is not comparability but acceptability. We are back operating under the rules of whatever the traffic will bear. Comparability which gives or takes to the tune of half a billion dollars isn't comparability. It is expediency.

Recently, I introduced a bill to repeal the provisions of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, providing pay comparability between employees of the Federal Government and employees in private industry.

I did so after published reports of April 22 that there is talk of classified and postal employees "appealing to the courts to force Congress to follow through on the 1962 law that extended the comparability principle to their salaries."

I opposed adoption of this comparability provision when the legislation was originally before this House.

I then believed the principle was unsound. The provisions of this bill further confirm that belief.

I now also believe this provision is dangerous and that it invites judicial action designed to force the Congress to live up to its vague and ill-defined commitment.

As a matter of sound fiscal policy, I believe H.R. 11049—which superimposes a half billion dollar pay raise on the previous $1 billion pay raise—should be defeated.

As a matter of sound legislative policy involving perpetuation of the farce and hoax of comparability, I believe the bill should be defeated.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

(Mr. HENDERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11049. As chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee's Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, I have been increasingly impressed by the information developed by our subcommittee that the Government needs the best management that can be obtained to afford the world's largest and most complex business with the most able talent. This, in turn, insures the most efficient and economical use of our taxpayers' money.

I believe that unless principles of comparability of pay which were adopted by this House in October 1962, and now public law, are put into effect we are going to lose more and more of the top managers in the departments and agencies of our Government. I feel that an important key to the capability of our Government to meet the responsibility for our people lies in top management and we need adjustments now in salaries for these responsible jobs.

Within recent days the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee in public hearings has developed the fact that one of the critical management areas in the Government today is in the recruitment and retention of good top people. In fact, our subcommittee has found numerous instances where departments and agencies have had to resort to the use of employees furnished by private corporations at a much greater total cost to the Government, due to problems of recruiting Government personnel.

Mr. Chairman, I also strongly support an amendment which has been proposed by our able colleague, Hon. MORRIS UDALL of Arizona, who is also a member of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee. The amendment of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] which will tie the salaries of the Congressmen to the pay of the top level in the Classification Act series; namely, GS–18, will relieve the pressure in adjusting pay between the career employees and the Congress.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. Chairman, I would like to cite briefly to the Members the provisions of our report starting on page 8 entitled "Classification Act Grade Inflation."

It is rather lengthy, but I would like to read just a brief portion of it as follows:

The implementation by this legislation of the principle of comparability established by the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, Public Law 87-793, is intended by the committee to bring to an end the unjustified inflationary trend in the grade structure of positions under the Classification Act of 1949.

In other words, we point out that the passage of this bill is intended by the committee to bring to an end the unjustified inflationary trend in the grade structure of positions under the Classified Act of 1949.

Then we conclude on page 10 as follows:

The committee believes that the necessary tools of personnel management, in terms of adequate salaries, have now been provided by the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 and by this bill, the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964. It is expected that the principles of position classification and reclassification set forth in the Classification Act of 1949 will be strictly adhered to. The committee considers this a reaffirmation of congressional policy and, therefore, insists that management respect the grade structures which have been approved for particular positions. The committee will also expect the U.S. Civil Service Commission to exercise great care in the review and development of grade standards under the Classification Act.

This, Mr. Chairman, highlights what has been going on in the absence of appropriate rates of compensation. Management has found it necessary to raise the grades and thus increase the compensations in order to retain employees and to give salary increases.

Also, Mr. Chairman, there is another item in H.R. 11049, which I feel is a definite improvement over H.R. 8986. I have in mind an amendment which I proposed in the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and which was adopted by the committee and is now incorporated in H.R. 11049. This eliminates all fractions over a cent in the results of payroll calculations. It is my understanding that this item alone will save in the neighborhood of $10 to $12 million as compared to the bill which was voted on by the House in March.

Mr. Chairman, in order that we can continue to improve employee productivity in our Government, I believe that H.R. 11049 would be voted on favorably today by the House.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee.

Mr. DULSKI. I compliment the gentleman for the fine statement he has made, and I commend him for the work of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee, on which I had the privilege to serve under Judge DAVIS.

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, we can well understand the need for expeditious consideration now of the entire issue of Federal salary legislation if Congress is to keep faith with our dedicated postal and other career employees.

These employees have a right to expect our favorable consideration here today as a major step forward to reach some degree of comparability in our employee rates of compensation with the rates paid for comparable rates in private industry. This comparability is required by the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, and will be accomplished by H.R. 11049.

As my colleagues have pointed out here today, President Johnson on numerous occasions and in a letter to Speaker MCCORMACK on March 17, has called to our attention the urgent need for adjustment in rates of pay for all officers and employees including the top executive officials who are responsible for the operation of our Government.

Our employees in the lower levels now are far behind in rates of compensation as compared with an employee in private industry. They need the increases proposed in H.R. 11049 just to meet the ordinary everyday living expenses.

The most significant improvement in this bill, as compared with H.R. 8986, is a 25-percent reduction—from $10,000 down to $7,500—in the salary increases provided for Members of Congress, Federal judges, Cabinet officers, and immediate sub-Cabinet officers. These increases also will be postponed to January of 1965, whereas they would have been retroactive to January of 1964 under the earlier bill.

The total annual cost of the salary adjustments provided by H.R. 11049 will be $533 million, an amount which is $11 million less than the President's budget figure of $544 million. The President considers this bill one of the three most urgently needed legislative measures that he has recommended to the 88th Congress, and has strongly emphasized his personal support of its prompt enactment. I earnestly hope that this important bill will receive the approval of the membership of the House.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I stated before when this bill was first presented to the House that I was opposed to placing Postal and Classification Act employees in a package which also included legislative, executive and judicial salary increases. I stated then and I repeat now that I have always supported pay increases for our postal and classified employees and I would support increases for them now if the other three groups were divorced from the legislation. We held extensive hearings in the committee on the pay proposals for postal workers and regular civil service employees but there were no hearings held on the legislative, executive and judicial salary proposals. Evidently these latter sections were written in some other place than the House of Representatives. Salary legislation coming from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee should be confined to postal employees and members of the civil service system. Pay proposals affecting Congressmen, agency heads, Cabinet officers and judges should be considered by other committees as they have been in the past but such hearings were never held. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I do support title I of this bill but I do not support the other sections. If they are not separated from title I then I shall reluctantly be forced to vote against the entire bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN].

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the section of H.R. 11049 which increases the pay of the Members of Congress to $30,000.

As for myself, I knew what the pay was when I ran for election, and I cannot break faith with the people who elected me to this office.

I am very much in favor of the raises for postal employees and other employees in the Federal Government. They deserve this increase.

The congressional pay increase should be eliminated; and, if it is not, then I must vote against the bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, we shall have only one more speaker on this side.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if I can add anything to what has already been said, but my point in speaking is to associate myself with the able and distinguished committee, on both sides of the aisle. I compliment the committee. You have worked long, you have worked hard, and you have brought out a well-balanced, good bill.

I also compliment the Committee for the fine, orderly, high-grade debate you have had. It has been of the highest order.

I shall address my remarks to two points in regard to the bill. It is well rounded. It will cost some money. It will cost in the neighborhood of $532 million. It covers the executive branch, the judicial branch, and the Members of the Congress. About the smallest item of cost is for the Members of Congress. Did you know that? It is about $4 million. The cost for the judiciary is about another $4 million. The cost for the executive branch will be slightly more than $500 million.

Do my colleagues realize that this is the biggest business on earth? I refer now to the executive branch of this Government. It is the biggest business on earth.

Do you realize—I feel certain most of you do—that this Government is run by a small number of employees, elected individuals, and appointed individuals?

The executive branch of the Government is run by between 3,500 and 4,000 employees. No more. The President, the Cabinet officers, the sublevel officers, the agency officers, the commissioners, those

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

in supergrades of 16, 17, and 18, and a few in excepted positions, are the people who run the executive branch of our Government.

Do you know what the bill will cost for those? About $15 million a year.

The biggest economy you can make is to pay salaries which are commensurate with responsibilities and with duties. Look at the independent agency heads and Cabinet officers who are working for $25,000, or even $21,000. Most of them came from industry, where they were making two or three or four times as much.

I believe we can save by cutting down procurement, and perhaps, in the military, by putting in trained civilians rather than military men who were not trained in economics to do the job.

You can save that and 10 or 15 or 20 or maybe 100 times what it will cost you in 1 year for this special group.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I will be delighted to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Only a short time ago the gentleman's Subcommittee on Appropriations carried on some discussion of the huge deficit in the Federal employees' retirement fund.

Mr. THOMAS. Come on. Get down to what you have to say. I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know what this bill will contribute to the deficit and unsoundness of our budget position and the retirement fund?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think it will create any deficit, but it will create a surplus if it is managed right and if you get good people running your Government who spend $75 billion of your money. You will get better people that way, and I think it will save you money. It will pay for itself many, many, many times a year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMAS. I will be delighted to.

Mr. GROSS. It is the figures contained in the hearings by the gentleman's committee that I used to show that the Federal employees retirement fund is now $34 billion in the red.

Mr. THOMAS. What are you talking about? The civil service retirement fund? Of course it is.

Mr. GROSS. And this bill will make a very substantial contribution to the staggering deficit in the retirement fund.

Mr. THOMAS. To give you an exact answer, if you are trying to figure out what it will cost the retirement fund, over a period of 31 or 32 years, the lifetime of a Federal employee, it will cost you in the neighborhood of a billion dollars.

Mr. Chairman, let me say something about the membership. This bill is not going to help me or many of the Members I am now looking at who are my age. My children are just about out of college. They were born late. What about these young Members, with two or three or four children coming along? They must go to college. They cannot do it. Now, just be perfectly honest about it. They cannot do it on what they are getting now. I am speaking for you, not myself. I am not going to be here too long. It is not going to improve the Government service to pay me more than I am getting. Let us be frank about that. But when I leave I think you are going to get a better fellow than I am. Gentlemen, do the right thing by yourselves and your country. If you do, you will vote for this bill. There is nothing to be ashamed about in this bill. I have seen three or four pay raises in my day here, and I have not seen a single Member who voted for those pay raises penalized one iota.

I heartily recommend this bill to you in all of its aspects and forgive me for taking your time.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, of course, what I am going to say here is obviously just a matter of making the RECORD, because with the preparation that this House has been given by the committee, we are not in the position of debating the crucial issues that this bill presents to our country. President Johnson in his economic message to the Congress and to the Nation this year pointed out that there were inflationary forces loose which would be furthered this year, but these forces could be contained. In his message and in subsequent speeches he has addressed himself to the labor leaders and the management of this country to hold what has been called the wage-price guidelines, saying that this is not the time for wage and price increases even though there are many areas in the private sector and certainly in the governmental sector where there need to be adjustments of our wage scales.

Because I have been critical of this committee in my remarks during the debate on the rule, let me offer some element of praise—and it is deserved—for some of the studies that the committee has been making in this field of Federal employment practices. I have been following them.

There is the matter of comparability, a very necessary and important principle, job reclassifications, and so forth. Certainly a great deal needs to be done in this area, in my judgment. We do need to do something at the proper time to uplift salaries, particularly at the higher levels.

Most of this debate, as Members can tell, is directed toward what is only 1 percent of the bill, the salary increase for Congressmen. That is not the real concern that I am expressing here. The concern that I am expressing here is that which the President of the United States has expressed to management and labor in this country. And the biggest employer in the United States, of course, is the Federal Government.

Are we going to have our deeds so far removed from our words, that the President of the United States can talk out of one side of his mouth to the private sector of the economy, and to this Congress, in regard to Federal employees, out of the other side? If this committee had done the job that I expected it to do in regard to this specific bill—not the general principles of employment practices on which the committee has done good work—it would have related this to productivity increases and to our fiscal situation in 1964 as far as deficit financing is concerned. The committee would have tried to see whether at this time the Federal Government can set this kind of example even though it is true, and I reiterate, that wage scales should move up in the Federal Government, and we have got to do a great deal of work there. We are not following the President's wage price guidelines.

We have a very serious situation in the matter of the balance of payments. All we have been doing is buying time, and the President has said this.

The Committee on Ways and Means has just finished going over the picture of what we might recommend in the matter of increasing social security benefits. Why? Because since 1958 the cost of living has gone up through creeping inflation around 8 percent. This would be $1 billion added to the cost of Government. We have these inflationary forces at play. When you increase the cost-of-living index one point, you take $4 billion out of the purchasing power of this country.

These are the things, if you want to appeal to patriotism, that we should be discussing. But there is no material in the committee report for this House to consider, because there were no hearings and there was no discussion on this point.

Finally, if I may, Mr. Chairman, I should like to refer to the congressional salaries. The issue, as I tried to point out in the debate on the previous bill is not whether full-time Congressmen should get more money if we are going to have the kind of men we want in Congress, because with that I agree. The issue, though, is over representative government itself. It is the kind of representative government we are to have. Are Congressmen to be full time? I suggest that you would not have good representative government on that theory, and I suggest under the theory of this Constitution Congressmen are supposed to be part time. They are supposed to live in their communities in order to properly represent their communities. What we need to do is to start to obey the law which says that the Congress shall adjourn by July 31 each year. And we can get our work done if we will eliminate this Tuesday-to-Thursday operation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

(Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to say that I strongly favor H.R. 11049, the so-called Morrison pay increase bill for Federal employees and postal workers. I believe it is a good bill and that it should be

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

promptly passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, in 1962, the U.S. Congress through the enactment of the Federal Salary Reform Act made a promise to our Federal employees and our postal workers that we in Congress would keep the Federal pay scales at a relatively comparable level with private industry. This is necessary for basic justice and fairness.

Mr. Chairman, that policy of comparability has been adopted as an overall policy for the United States. This policy action was with the approval of the large majority of the Congress of the United States. The question, then, is at this particular point will the Congress live up to this promise? Will Congress continue the policy of comparability of Federal pay scales with private industry which after much debate and many hearings and research has been adopted as a basic policy? My answer is a definite "Yes."

My own recommendation is that the U.S. Congress do live up to its promise to these Federal employees and postal workers first, and that, second, the Congress specifically by this bill continue the policy of comparability. That means I favor passage of the bill H.R. 11049 because I believe that it has been prepared by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] and the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on the basis of those principles. Pay raises for Congress should only be comparable to the pay raises provided for other Federal employees. We should not treat Congress any differently nor any better than any other Federal employee.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Congress should keep the policy of an honest day's work for an honest day's pay, and a full day's work for a full day's pay. Congress sometimes forgets that not only the full day's work is required of our Federal employees, but also the full day's pay to compensate for the work performed.

This bill is not legislation that is inflationary. So, I disagree with my distinguished friend the gentleman from Missouri who feels that bill represents an inflationary step and that proper study has not been made of this factor.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I state that this bill is not inflationary is because the major part of the pay increase goes to people now whom everybody feels are underpaid and who are actually economically marginal when considered in light of the President's figures in the proposed poverty program.

How can these good people who are Government employees find themselves falling back in the economic system and falling back further than others so that their families are deprived of the basic necessities and educational opportunities for their children? My own feeling is that Congress should now see to it that these families do have the necessary cost-of-living increase. They are entitled to the increase not only on the basis of the promise of the Congress in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, but they are also entitled to the increase on the basis that the cost of living has gone up with respect to every major factor of the cost of living index in the United States. These people and their families have been left behind in the Nation's economic progress to such an extent that there is a gap for Federal employees and postal workers, and they are substantially behind the cost-of-living increase, and will be comparable to private industry pay scales of 1962 even when this current pay increase is added.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the difficulty with the argument of the gentleman from Missouri, whose research and study I value highly, is that his position reflects his idea that this will be moving the Federal and postal employees out into the forefront of salary increases so that they will be leading the van rather than following.

Mr. Chairman, coming from the industrial area of Pittsburgh and having knowledge of industrial and private enterprise pay scales with that knowledge and experience in mind, I would say to the members that as far as the industrial and production workers are concerned or agricultural processing workers or the retail workers are concerned, that the Federal employees for the work they do, for the intelligence required, for the dedication to their work, are really behind, not equal nor ahead of the general wage levels and pay scales in the U.S. economy at this time.

Congress should give special consideration to our U.S. Government employees and postal workers as they are the particular responsibility of the U.S. Congress. These employees do not have industrial collective bargaining powers. They are under no collective bargaining laws, they have no right to strike nor to engage in slow-downs, nor no right to picket. They have no rights to bargain for wage rates, hours, conditions of employment, nor fringe benefits that generally go along with industrial collective bargaining procedures in private industry.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman is making a pertinent argument, but that is part of the material I suggest that the committee might look into as to whether or not in this time when the President has urged wage-price guidelines an exception should be made for Federal employees. I may say to the gentleman from Pittsburgh that we have the auto workers coming up for wage increases, we have the steelworkers and other coming up for new contracts. In fact, we have about 100 major labor-management contracts coming up this summer and fall. All of these groups are claiming they should have an exception made, but we do not even attempt to make the case in committee for an exception on behalf of the Federal employees. Honestly, I do not think a distinction can be made that would stand up, as between the Federal Government employees and all of the wage earners we have in the private sector who want a wage increase.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman and I are not far apart in our reasoning, but we start with different premises. I start with the premise that the U.S. Government employees, including the postal workers, are behind the other comparable workers in private industry. I think it can be very adequately demonstrated that the Bureau of Labor Statistics on the cost of living have indicated a present increase for the Federal employees and postal workers just to bring their pay scales up to what the cost of living is indicated for 1962, 2 years ago.

I would disagree with the gentleman in certain other respects. I come from an industrial area. I do not want the salaries and wages leveled off and kept at a permanent level forever. I am a progressive Republican. I want the salaries and wages to increase as our U.S. economy grows. I want the people in Government and the private economy to know if they do hard work and get good production a good future is ahead, and it is bright and cheerful.

The other type of aproach is, the present situation is good enough the way it is, just let it ride along, then we will correct minor injustices. But that does not lead to the future when we have a climbing gross national product that is going up substantially each year through increased production and efficiency by the working people of this country. Our U.S. gross national product is now above $600 billion.

I believe within the U.S. economy there is room that can be predicted for expansion so that we can raise in this bill above mere subsistence levels, the salaries and pay of these people who are contributing substantially to the U.S. economy. It is not a matter where we are giving people incentives and subsidies when they do not produce, as it is not an economic advantage to have the Government money distributed from the U.S. Treasury to these groups. These U.S. Government workers are producing groups, and this pay raise is justly due, and it is no handout.

I strongly recommend the passage of this bill, and hope that my colleagues this afternoon will vote its passage with a resounding majority.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I understand there are no further requests for time on our side, so we can get on with the reading of the bill for amendment in just a moment, but before that I should like to make a few observations.

There has been talk here about inflation, deficit spending, and debt increase. I have a table here prepared by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission, and I would say that the rates paid in private industry are considerably above what the classified and other employees are making. The hard fact of the matter is that even with the rates provided in this bill in all but two of the smallest categories of the bill the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Federal employees will be well under comparability with private industry.

I would say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] that if we were beginning to pay Federal employees 110 percent of what the same skill is paid in private industry there might be some ground for concern, but the truth of the matter is that this bill falls short in most grades, and in nearly all of the grades with the overwhelming number of employees, of comparability with private industry.

This is not just an ordinary salary bill. I know that the oldtime Members of this House have been frustrated and confused in dealing with salary legislation over the years. This is a different kind of bill. It is one of the most important bills for good management in the Federal Government I think we have ever had. The reason is that as far as I can determine this is the first time in 100 years the Congress has sat down with all the Federal employees and said, "We are going to construct a logical, orderly salary system from the janitor down in GS–1 to the President of the United States, and each position is going to be fixed and have its salary fixed with relationship to the responsibility of that position to other positions. We are going to have an orderly, interrelated, properly proportioned salary system." This is a very important goal.

Let me tell you how ridiculous this system is today. In the past, one committee would fix the pay for a certain group of employees and another committee would fix the pay of certain Federal executives. Judges and Congressmen were handled by one committee. Other Federal officials would be handled by still other committees. We have reached the absurd point today where we have a ceiling, the pay of Congress, of $22,500, and we have a floor, which is the career employees, that are now getting about $20,000. Congress will not stand still, and very properly, I think, for having agency heads or other Federal managers, the key people that make this Government run, being paid more than the Members of Congress. So today we have jammed in between $20,000 and $22,500 all the 13 levels of responsibility. In any comparable industrial concern those levels of responsibility would range in salary from $30,000 to $200,000 or $300,000, and we jam them in this one range.

Let me give you a specific example. The man who administers the $5 billion budget of the Veterans' Administration, which is one part of his job, is administering 151 veterans hospitals. We pay him $21,000. The man who administers one of those hospitals gets about $300 or $400 less, and the man who runs a wing in one of those hospitals gets a few dollars less than that. We do not have proportionate levels of responsibility. Pay is not comparable with responsibility. I think this is a ridiculous situation.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield briefly.

Mr. KUNKEL. That same situation occurs also in veterans' hospitals, where the head administrator and his assistant administrator get less than some of the doctors that work in the hospital under them, not only less but substantially less. That makes for a very bad situation in addition to the money. This is particularly true of the Veterans' Administration. I am thinking that they could very easily step out of the hospital and make far more in private practice.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is right. I thank him for his contribution. I hope he will support the bill, because the bill will correct that situation.

Let me close on one thing that I have found to be in effect today. I got on a jet plane the other night and on the plane came the chairman of one of the most important committees of this House. He is a man who has been here over two or three decades. He has a fund of knowledge and expertise that could not be duplicated for any amount of money. He is an important man, whose decisions affect the security and the lives of everybody in this country. We pay this man $22,500. And as the Senator from Illinois put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a couple of weeks ago, he is an accountant and an economist; he kept track all year and when he got through he would net $7,000 after he paid for his transportation and taxes. This is the kind of salary we pay a man in this important position. So I got to thinking about the chairman of this committee—he is not here and I will not mention his name—I found out that the pilot of the airplane makes more than he does and has a much easier time, with only one home to maintain. There were two generals or two major generals on the airplane who have very minor responsibilities. This chairman has problems 500 times as important as they have and they are making more money than he does.

I had an assistant vice president of a little manufacturing company in the seat next to me and we got to discussing that. He makes more than the chairman makes.

The Chief of Naval Operations, just one of the admirals and generals who help to run our Military Establishment, is paid $32,000 plus.

We have gotten ourselves into a ridiculous situation. The pay of the Congress has been raised four times in the last 100 years since 1866. We got ourselves in a box through our own fault, through neglecting Executive pay, congressional pay, and judicial pay.

I am going to offer an amendment when we reach the amending stage which I think will prevent the Congress from ever again finding itself in the situation that we find ourselves in today.

This is a good bill. It is carefully drawn and carefully thought out and I hope it will be approved overwhelmingly by the House today.

Mr. Chairman, when we took up the Federal pay bill last March, the point was made that adjustments were desperately needed if we wanted to retain first-rate, capable people in the policy-making jobs at the top of our Federal Establishment. The argument was made that managerial talent does not come cheaply, and that we cannot expect to run our Federal agencies efficiently if we cannot get the best people possible to guide them.

Well, this warning has already borne fruit in the weeks that have passed since we rejected that pay bill. Once word was out that we were not going to do anything about the grossly inadequate pay for the top positions in our Federal Government the resignations started coming in. I do not know how many there have been, but there have been quite a few. Here are some examples:

Mortimer Caplin has done an outstanding job as our Commissioner of Internal Revenue. We may not like to have our taxes collected, but it is a job that has to be done, and Mr. Caplin has done extremely well in administering this vital agency. Last month he announced his resignation. He cited personal reasons, but I am certain that high on his list of reasons was the totally inadequate pay he was receiving, $21,000, while supervising the collection of approximately a hundred billion dollars a year to operate our Federal Government. A single error on his part could cost the American people many times his entire salary, but we said 3 months ago that he should not get a raise.

Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has announced his resignation since we rejected the last pay bill. There is no doubt that his financial needs were a major factor. And we ought to reflect on the fact that he will be making considerably more money as a college professor than he made as this Nation's top economic adviser. This is ridiculous and testimony to the shortsightedness of the Federal Government in dealing with its own key personnel.

Henry Fowler, our Under Secretary of the Treasury, waited only a short time after we rejected that pay bill to announce his resignation. Undoubtedly the low level of executive compensation in the Federal Government was a factor in this decision. Surely there are few more important jobs needing top brains and top know-how than that of Under Secretary of the Treasury. Now we have to try to find another highly qualified man to go to work for $21,000 a year. It is not going to be easy.

James K. Carr has served the Government well as Under Secretary of Interior. A few days ago he announced his resignation to accept a job as manager of a west coast utility. It is sad but true that the Federal Government cannot compete with most of the public and private utilities in the country when it comes to compensation.

And there have been other resignations. For example, let us look at our own Library of Congress. This is not just an adjunct to the House and Senate, a little repository of odds and ends. It is the world's largest library, the cornerstone of our library system in the United States. You cannot run an institution like this with the brains and talent you might pick up on the street. You need very special people with very special qualifications.

We have a man like this in Rutherford D. Rogers, our Deputy Librarian. But we will not have him long, because he announced his resignation less than 30 days

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

after we rejected our last pay bill. I happen to know that he liked his job and would have liked to remain on. But when we turned down an increase for him he decided to take a job for the State of California, at a sizable increase in pay with considerably less responsibility.

If the State of California, the State of Minnesota and other smaller units of government can lure away our top men with higher pay, there is something wrong with our system of compensation in the Federal service. There simply is no reason why the Federal Government cannot at least match the pay of State and local governments for equal jobs. When the Federal jobs involve greater responsibility, as they often do, surely they should command salaries in excess of those paid by State and local governments. We are not doing that today.

Passage of this bill today will not eliminate all inequities, but it will make the Federal Government somewhat more competitive in seeking the most capable people for our most important policy-making jobs. Failure to do this would simply mean a continuing raid on the best brains we have in the Federal service today. I do not think we can afford to lose these people at the rate they are departing today.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time for our Nation to be losing its top managers. I say this advisedly because the record of the past 3 years shows a pattern of increasing efficiency and cost reduction.

The efforts of the late President Kennedy and of President Johnson are beginning to pay dividends in savings to the taxpayers. These savings are being realized through sharper and better management of civilian employment in the executive branch of our Government. Let me give some examples.

When the 1964 budget was submitted to the Congress in January, 1963, it was estimated that employment at mid-year would amount to 2,538,400. As it turned out, employment on June 30 was 2,490,300. That was 48,100 workers less than had been anticipated, a clear result of the vigorous efforts of the President and his executive agency heads to hold employment down.

The picture this year is even more significant. When the 1965 budget was submitted, it was estimated that employment on June 30, 1964, would be 2,578,500. During the review of the new budget the Bureau of the Budget conducted a very searching examination of agency employment estimates. The result was that the estimate for midyear was reduced by 58,100 in the submission of the budget. This was a big and important saving.

Subsequent to the submission of the budget this year the President had two reviews made of employment plans of the agencies. The result was that 15,200 additional positions were eliminated from the anticipated midyear employment. Therefore, instead of employment reaching a total of 2,512,400, it is now expected that employment will not exceed 2,497,200. President Johnson has made this a ceiling and has told agency heads not to exceed this number. Now you cannot make reductions like this without good management, and we are making such reductions.

When the President finished his review of agency efforts to reduce employment totals earlier this year, he proposed to the Congress a series of amendments to the 1965 budget. Included in these amendments were reductions of more than $26 million directly attributable to employment cutbacks. And here is where the taxpayers benefit from the managerial skill and know-how of our agency heads.

When one considers that from the time of the 1964 budget message to the present there has been a total reduction of 73,300 employees from the level previously anticipated as needed, the significance of these results becomes impressive.

Employment for fiscal 1964 was estimated to be about 22,100 over 1963. As of the end of April the increase had amounted to only 1,800 in regular employment. Recognizing that 15,000 of the anticipated increase has been eliminated, the executive branch is still well below its planned employment level.

We can be pleased with these accomplishments, and they are testimony to the value of having first-rate people running our executive agencies. I do not think we want to turn these matters over to less capable people.

Mr. Chairman, there is one final matter I want to discuss today because it has been a cause of concern to many of our colleagues. I refer to the opposition frequently expressed by the Scripps-Howard newspapers to congressional pay increases. Many of the Nation's leading newspapers have supported this legislation as necessary and vital, but the newspapers of the Scripps-Howard chain have regularly downgraded and insulted the Congress of the United States as a second-class body undeserving of the compensation accorded thousands of officials in State and local government, and tens of thousands of executives in private industry.

I think this is unfortunate because I think that the Scripps-Howard newspapers are basically fair and honest. I think, for example, that they have served the public well in the stand they have taken in support of conservation. But I deplore the petty, ill-informed and carping criticism they have made of Federal salary legislation, and particularly of needed increases in the pay of Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly offended by the position of the Scripps-Howard newspapers when I learn, as I did today, that they pay their own executives salaries far in excess of the top decisionmakers of our Federal Government.

They object to paying the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, a man with enormous responsibilities, anything over $22,500 a year, but they pay the president and publisher of the Cincinnati Enquirer, Mr. Roger H. Ferger, a salary of $75,000 a year plus retirement rights amounting to another $39,743. That is a total of $114,743 for the publisher of one newspaper in Cincinnati compared to $22,500 for the chairman of a committee overseeing a budget in excess of $50 billion a year.

But that is only the beginning. There are many more examples. For instance, Scripps-Howard pays the executive vice president and secretary of that same newspaper a total compensation of nearly $85,000. And yet the Cincinnati Enquirer, along with other Scripps-Howard newspapers, objects to paying more than $22,500 to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, a man whose tremendous knowledge and ability guide the tax policies of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Scripps-Howard newspapers have taken a wrong stand on Federal salary legislation. I suspect they have not made the kind of study of the facts that should precede such expressions of opinion, so widely disseminated. Actually, I think these newspapers are doing a good job, in many cases an excellent job in reporting the news and commenting on it. But I believe they are wholly wrong in the stand they have taken, and I believe they are guilty of sheer hypocrisy in opposing increases in salaries for Members of Congress on the grounds that they either do not deserve them or can easily be replaced.

I know some outstanding reporters who work for the Scripps-Howard organization. I get the impression they are not too highly paid. In fact, if the argument is valid that pay should not be increased when replacements are waiting at present salary levels, I would suggest that Scripps-Howard not raise any of its executives another dollar. Instead, I would suggest that they promote some of these exceptional reporters they have working in their newsrooms, and let them step into some of these management positions. I do not doubt that they might even be willing to take a job as executive vice president or secretary for a few dollars less than Scripps-Howard is paying today. If the management's logic is right for Members of Congress, then surely it would be right for their own organization.

Mr. Chairman, when we vote today, I hope we will ignore such inconsistent counsel as we have been given so gratuitously by the newspapers of the Scripps-Howard chain.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the Federal salary bill has now been revised, lowered in cost, and improved sufficiently so that I can give it my full support. The earlier bill that was sent back to committee by a heavy vote weeks ago deserved to be sent back for revision.

The annual cost of this new bill is over $20 million less. The unjustified and exhorbitant increases for political staff people in the House that were in the earlier bill have been trimmed down to proper proportions. Salary increases for Congressmen and Federal judges have been reduced from $10,000 to $7,500, and made effective next year in the new Congress instead of immediately. Salary adjustments for career Federal employees are not made retroactive but will become effective after passage of this

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

legislation into law. Otherwise, the new bill makes necessary but scaled down adjustments to the executive, judicial, and legislative branches. Increasingly I fear the day that only rich men can go into public service. In recent years several highly qualified lawyers in New York City have refused to serve on the Federal court because they could not live on the salary, which is the same as congressional salaries, $22,500.

I know of two men, very highly qualified for elective office, who refused to run for local office in New York City when many good citizens wanted them to run, because they could not afford it. It is common knowledge that increasingly, men of great wealth have turned to politics, in part, because of the vacuum left by others who could not afford it. Similarly, men in the sub-Cabinet echelons of the executive branch have dropped out because they have not been able to afford it. Most importantly, Federal employees in places like the city of New York connot exist. Those with children are squeezed to death. They and their wives must take weekend and other supplemental jobs. The pay is a living wage in parts of the South and West, but not in Manhattan.

The bill has been vastly improved, and it should now be enacted.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, under Public Law 220 of the 83d Congress, a 17-member Commission was appointed to consider the adequacy of salaries being paid to the Members of the Congress and the judiciary. This Commission was composed of six representatives of agriculture, six representatives of labor, and five representatives of business and the professions. They were assisted by three Members of the House, three Members of the Senate, and three from the judiciary.

This Commission, Mr. Chairman, conducted extensive hearings, and made a very comprehensive study of the subject assigned to it under Public Law 220 of the 83d Congress. Its report, recommending substantial increases, was presented to the Congress early in 1954. Many newspaper editors, writers, and columnists along with many labor, civic, and professional organizations and leaders urged adoption of this report. After full and careful consideration by the appropriate committee, H.R. 3828 was proposed to carry out the recommendations of the aforementioned Commission. This measure was debated fully on the floor of the House on February 16, 1955, and was approved on a rollcall vote 283 to 118.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against H.R. 3828 as shown on pages 1588 and 1589 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 16, 1955, and stated:

I regard the handling of public funds as a sacred trust. I did not seek the high office I now have the honor to occupy for the purpose of making a big salary, but rather for the opportunity of being of public service. Due to the continuing need for large Defense appropriations, our Federal budget is not yet balanced. Also there is great need for increased compensation of our postal employees, civil service employees, and members of our Armed Forces. I wish there had been two bills so that salaries of Members of the Congress and the judiciary could have been considered separately (from those of the postal, civil service employees, and members of the Armed Forces). Since, however, both were included, I felt compelled to vote against this bill at this time.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, and again after many months of careful consideration by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, this committee recommended another measure, H.R. 8986, and it was fully debated on the floor of this House for 2 days. The basic purpose of this proposed measure was to comply with the action of the 87th Congress in approving the principle that postal employees and civil service employees shall be paid salaries comparable to those paid workers in private enterprise for comparable levels of responsibilities, skills, and performance.

Mr. Chairman, I am personally in full accord and sympathy with these basic principles. Such a policy encourages Federal employees to make a career of Government work and responsibilities and thus greatly reduces the cost of training new employees to replace Federal employees who seek employment in private enterprise where wages are higher.

Other sections of H.R. 8986, however, would have substantially increased the salaries paid to members of the Federal judiciary; executives and their assistants in departments, boards, agencies, and commissions of the executive branch; and Members of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, many Members of the House, and I am one of them, believe there is no shortage of capable and willing personnel to fill positions of responsibility in the judicial and executive branches of the Federal Government. Members of the House, individually and collectively, know that there is never any shortage of candidates in both political parties who vigorously seek election to this great body and who seek to defeat present Members of the House. I am sure these candidates are not motivated solely by the present salaries paid to Members of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, in all fairness to postal employees and civil service employees, many of them have urged me to support this legislation not only because it would give them a much needed and proper increase in their own income but they also expressed their completely sincere opinions that they felt equally deeply as to the need and justification for substantially increased salaries for Members of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, while I deeply appreciated this sincere expression of their interest in me personally, as a Member of the Congress, I found it necessary to point out and recall to their attention, that Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1956 when the previous congressional salaries were in effect, that Federal expenditures were then $69.5 billion—that the Federal budget was not only in balance but that there was an actual surplus of $6.8 billion, and that the total national debt was then $272.7 billion.

Mr. Chairman, the current 1964 fiscal year expenditures are now estimated to be $119.1 billion, nearly $50 billion higher than in fiscal year 1956. Also that the national debt is expected to reach $312 or more billion in this current month of June 1964. The Congess will be called upon within the next few days to vote on the extension of "wartime" excise taxes for another 2-year period and the Congress will also be called upon to approve still another and higher national debt limitation in spite of the fact that much has been said about the very high economy our Nation is now enjoying. The Congress is also being constantly urged to approve greatly expanded existing Federal programs and a number of entirely new ones the total cost of which cannot be estimated with any degree of accuracy. Thus the Congress is being constantly urged to increase Federal spending and at the same time urged to reduce taxes. Just how this sort of action can be reconciled as being fiscally responsible, prudent, and proper is not at all clear to many of us.

Mr. Chairman, we are now here today considering a new bill, H.R. 11049, which seeks to do the same things as proposed in H.R. 8986, which I voted against just recently on a rollcall vote and which was defeated—yeas, 184; and nays, 222. There have been some few changes made in this new proposal and yet it is substantially the same and is, of course, for the same purpose.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I would like very much to vote in favor of a measure to provide for much needed pay increases for our postal workers and our civil service employees. Since, however, it is insisted that all these other categories of judicial, executive, and congressional salaries are also still included, I find myself in the position of having to vote "no" again.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that there will be a record rollcall vote on H.R. 11049 so that I will have an opportunity to be publicly recorded on this measure. If, however, due to any parliamentary procedure, a record rollcall vote is not obtained, I have made these remarks today for the RECORD so that my personal position will be clearly understood by everyone and anyone who desires to know.

Mr. Chairman, if this measure is defeated today, it is my earnest hope that the administration will bring out a bill promptly to provide for appropriate increases in the wages of postal employees and civil service employees.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I am basically in agreement with the provisions of H.R. 11049 which pertain to postal and Federal classified employees. I am opposed, however, to the provision of the bill authorizing a $7,500 salary increase for Members of Congress.

This was my position when the pay bill was voted on earlier this year. I voted against the increase under the motion to recommit, which would have increased the salary of Members of Congress by $7,500, and I also voted against passage of the bill, which would have authorized the full $10,000 increase.

I am completely in accord with the principle of comparability which was pledged in the pay raise legislation enacted in October of 1962. Unquestion-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ably, Federal salary rates should be comparable to private enterprise salary rates for the same level of work if the Government is to recruit and retain well-qualified personnel. This is an eminently fair policy and it should be implemented.

But I would also like to see implemented some of the spending restraints and budget cuts that have been promised. It would hardly seem we are exerting a stringent discipline over Government spending if we approve the sizable increase in our salaries proposed by this bill.

I hope the pay raise proposed for Members of Congress will be eliminated from the bill so that I can support the increases for postal and classified employees. If this provision is not removed, I will have to vote against passage of the bill.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, in March when the pay raise bill was up before the House I voted against that measure. I did so because I felt then that the raises for Congressmen and other Federal executives were excessive and also because I felt Congress needed to earn a pay raise. My feelings in regard to Congress earning a pay raise have not changed. While the bill has been modified, raises reduced, delayed, I still firmly believe that Congress has not really earned a pay raise. I regret very much that congressional pay raises even though they are not effective until January 1965 are tied to this bill. I would rather that subject be dealt with separately. But this is not the case.

I have favored and continue to advocate pay raises for postal employees and other civil service workers; especially those in the lower grades. I also support raises for congressional employees, who we all know are deserving of such consideration. All of these raises, of course, are necessary because Congress has failed in its responsibility to control the inflationary forces.

I realize the problem of acquiring and retaining qualified people in many of the executive agencies. This is regrettable because we need top-caliber people in those jobs. I would support raises for those jobs. I do not believe one should have to sacrifice financially to serve his Government.

I am happy to see that some of the other pay raises to House employees have been modified. These it seems to me had also been excessive.

I have studied H.R. 11049, the committee report and the minority views very carefully. I have some reservations about the advisability of the bill in its present form. It will cost a great deal of money, and yet we are in an austerity campaign, and so on. But I have come to the conclusion that this bill should pass.

I do not believe postal employees should be penalized because congressional pay raises are in the bill. I had hoped that after H.R. 8986 was defeated we would get an opportunity to vote on a bill that would include pay raises for just postal and civil service employees. Such legislation, I believe, would pass overwhelmingly. The modification of other pay raises, the elimination of others, and the general improvement of the bill are the other factors which now allow me to support the bill.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, it was just 3 months ago when we last considered a similar bill with these sweeping Federal pay raises. I opposed the bill at that time and I oppose it again now. It is simply poor business to raise anybody's salary when you do not have the money to pay for it. And I cannot condone charging up bills for our children and grandchildren to pay.

Actually there is little difference between the current bill and the one the House defeated in March. Reducing the proposed salary increases for Members of Congress from $10,000 to $7,500 a year has not made this bill any more palatable. As I have maintained all along, there should be no consideration of Federal pay boosts until the Congress has shown some indication of living within this Nation's means.

And we have shown no such inclination. In fact, with 10 of the 12 major appropriations bills already passed, we are appropriating at a greater rate than a year ago, and we are about to raise the so-called temporary debt limit by another $9 billion, a clear admission that this Government plans to run in the red for at least another year.

Let this Congress go on record in favor of fiscal responsibility. Let us show the American taxpayer that we can live economy as well as talk about it. Let us balance that budget. Let us put a permanent ceiling on the national debt limit, then stick to it. Then perhaps we can discuss salary increases. But not before.

Mr. Chairman, I personally resent the way this bill has been presented. It is obvious that a great deal of daily nose counting has taken place, with proponents waiting until the moment when they are most assured of success. This is pure chicanery. Such a bill, calling for the expenditure of borrowed money, should be brought up for action with plenty of notice and proper committee hearings so that adequate debate can take place. It is another case of ramming legislation through, regardless of the effect it has on the American taxpayer.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, for the second time this year, we are considering a bill to adjust salaries. The bill proposes a Commission headed by Clarence Randall, former president of Inland Steel Co., who also was assigned similar responsibilities by President Eisenhower. That commission recommended certain salary schedules as being comparable for Federal employees to the salaries received by non-Government employees. This bill would bring most employees up to the income non-Government employees received 2 years ago and would make congressional, judicial, and top executive salaries to a level of about two-thirds what non-Government employers pay for comparable services. In addition to that, the average Senator and Congressman who is doing his job has about $8,000 per year in non-reimbursed necessary expenses.

More than 20 employees of the State of Iowa and several school and city employees in Iowa receive more than U.S. Senators, Congressmen, Federal judges and top U.S. executives. Salaries of more than 1,000 city employees receive more salary than top Federal officials. The Federal Government of the leading Nation of the world cannot be satisfied with mediocre, second-rate people who cannot get a better job elsewhere, nor can we afford a Congress where all Members have either great outside interests or are beholden to a special interest. We need a Congress which represents a cross-section of America.

Federal salaries are now 2.7 percent of our national income and this is a lesser percentage than they were 10 years ago. Most businesses are now paying a larger percentage of their income in salaries and this proves that efficiency, as compared to salaries for Federal employees, has been comparably good. While adjusting salaries, we do have a right to expect good enough productivity so that the cost of Government per unit of goods and services continues to reduce.

As I stated when similar legislation was under consideration last March, I thought the increase for some should have been less and that the increase for Congressmen and Senators should be delayed until next January. Both conditions are met in the bill now under consideration.

I also would still like to see an anti-nepotism bill pass and will continue to press for one. It is interesting to note that many opponents of this legislation finance part of their family expenses by putting members of their families on their payroll or do not maintain a home in their home State.

The Des Moines Register on May 6, 1964 carried an editorial which I believe stated the opinion of most Iowans. At least it is in accordance with some surveys that have been made. It is as follows:

FEDERAL SALARIES TOO LOW

The Federal pay raise bill, beaten last March in the House by a 222–184 margin, may have a new lease on life as a result of approval by the House Civil Service Committee last week of a modified version of the measure.

The original bill called for raises for 1.7 million Federal Government employees at an annual cost of $545 million. The biggest hikes—of $10,000 a year—were for Federal judges, Cabinet and sub-Cabinet posts, and Members of Congress. The revised version calls for trimming the top raises to $7,500, cutting the total cost of $533 million and delaying the biggest increases until next January.

The bill ran into trouble in the House primarily because of opposition to increasing congressional pay. Congressmen were understandably edgy about going on record in favor of giving themselves a raise in an election year. The new version would permit an election to intervene before a Representative could qualify for the increase.

We hope the congressional pay part of the new bill will not be allowed to obscure the need for action to upgrade Federal salaries, particularly at the higher levels. The top pay of department heads—$25,000—is ridiculously low for the caliber of people needed to man such Cabinet positions as Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, Secretary of Labor, etc. This salary determines

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

in turn the pay of assistant secretaries, deputy secretaries, and under secretaries, whose pay can be no more than $19,000 to $21,000.

President Johnson recently described the plight of Dr. Walter Heller, his chief economic adviser, who is leaving Government work after 3 years in Washington. Dr. Heller, who has an ailing wife and three children in college, is leaving chiefly because he can earn twice his present $20,500 salary outside Government.

The New York Times recently cited the case of an assistant director of the budget who describes his 3 years in Washington, dealing with such costly issues as the size of the foreign aid program and whether to construct a supersonic transport, as "the most exciting adventure imaginable." The official, who left a $30,000 post to accept his $20,000 Washington assignment, was forced to withdraw $8,000 from savings and borrow from life insurance and the Government's credit union to support his family of five children and pay nonreimbursable expenses connected with his job. His new position, with a private California firm, will pay $40,000 a year.

Private business long ago realized the necessity for paying top salaries to attract and keep able people. State and local governments are increasingly paying officials more than the Federal Government is able to pay even its Cabinet members. The Federal pay raise bill will help redress the balance and is long overdue for adoption.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to speak out on this proposed salary increase for Government employees. I would like to do it in person, but I regret that the disastrous flood in Montana, which has taken many lives and caused uncounted millions in property damage, has called members of the Public Works Subcommittee on Flood Control to that stricken State for an immediate survey.

Regarding the pay bill, I must say that I cannot, in good conscience, support it because it still included the increase in salary for Members of Congress while the budget remains unbalanced. The fact that we have to borrow money to grant such a pay raise just does not make fiscal sense to me.

I do believe, however, in the theory of comparability of pay between public and private employees. It is regrettable that we could not act upon this portion of the bill separately so that those public employees whose pay is not comparable to similar jobs in private industry could be brought into conformity.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, my principal reason for opposing this bill is that I sincerely believe that the time has come when those of us associated with the Federal Government must set the example.

Over the years I have watched excessive Federal spending become the principal cause for inflation which destroys the purchasing power of employees in the lower income brackets. Social security, old-age benefits, savings accounts, stocks and dividends for the elderly are being whittled away by wild Federal spending and inflation.

If we hold the line against Federal spending in Washington, we could give every American two raises. First his money would buy more, and second we could give him further tax reductions. Federal spending and Federal salary increases when contributing to inflation and cheap money will destroy the very objective we seek.

Our postal employees are doing a magnificent job and deserve with many others an increase, particularly in the lower brackets; but, Mr. Speaker, the bad features of this bill outweigh the good. Frankly, I think we should have the courage to vote up or down any proposal for our own salary increase and vote up or down the Supreme Court salaries and not tie them on to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would gladly vote for the modest increase provided for the postal employees and other Federal employees in the lower income brackets, but I think it is wrong to tie our own $7,500 increase and the $7,500 for each member of the Supreme Court to this bill. Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for a bill which would provide a $7,500 increase for each Member of the Congress and the Supreme Court while giving a postal employee making $4,000 a $250-a-year raise.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, some months ago I felt a bit uncomfortable about voting myself a pay increase during my first term in Congress even though almost 90,000 hardworking Government constituents of mine in Maryland would have benefited directly by the bill and all Marylanders interested in economy and efficiency in Government would clearly benefit indirectly.

Today, when given the opportunity, I intend to vote again for the pay increase and hope to be back here next year to collect it. I have lost some of my political timidity on this issue because, in my view, the Congress cannot ignore its responsibility to raise congressional salaries along with Federal salaries.

I would like to suggest three basic reasons why this is true.

First, although I am a freshman, many of my colleagues are not, and it has been my experience in dealing with them that the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House have earned this increase not only on the basis of ability but in terms of time, sweat, and grief. Let me elaborate—time is something that a Congressman never has enough of for the demands on his time are unceasing. Sweat is something the Congressman has plenty of for he must work incessantly to maintain his position of political leadership and comprehend the nature of the complex decisions on national policies he must make every day. Grief is something that Congressmen seldom have shed for them, but symbolizes a part of the inherent nature of political life wherein a man's judgment is always open to criticism, a man's motives are always open to distortion, and his personal relationships are frequently shattered by the ambitious.

Second, some people have said that by raising congressional salaries, I will be jeopardizing my own job because everybody and his brother, so to speak, will want to run for Congress. Well, that is alright with me because I think that on election day the American people deserve a free choice among the best and I say "let the best man win" and the country will be the winner in the process. There is nothing wrong with paying a salary to Members of Congress that will attract more individuals to the political arena. This is not to imply that my present colleagues are not serving their constituents well, but it is rather to encourage more competition for the jobs that some people have neglected because of the financial remuneration involved.

Third, the pay raise for Congressmen is necessary because it is closely linked with the salary ceilings that are now set on many of the top jobs in our Federal Establishment. I am sure Members who have been here longer than I have seen literally thousands of top-flight civil servants come and go in Washington, primarily because of a serious deterioration in their personal financial position. Federal expenditures are equal to about one-sixth of our Nation's total product and it is important that the Federal Government seek and retain a proper share of the best men and the best minds in this country.

Recently Senator DOUGLAS gave us a striking example of what the "take home" pay of a Congressman really amounts to. I supported the disclosure amendment today, not because of a feeling that it will alter the basic integrity of those who come to Congress, but rather because the general public needs to know that we are not here in Washington getting rich at their expense.

Also regarding the "poverty war," while Congressmen are certainly not impoverished, I do not think that it is inconsistent for a Congressman to express his concern for the poor in America by enacting programs to benefit them while raising his own salary. The history of this country is replete with the stories of those who have continued to care for their fellow men regardless of the improvement in their own financial position—men like Carnegie, Ford, and Russell Sage who began as a grocery clerk.

In summary, I am ready to stand up and be counted for higher congressional salaries along with higher Federal salaries because, in the final analysis, it will mean better government.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this pay bill before us deliberately defies the true needs of Federal employees for equitable adjustment of salaries.

Representing as I do a district in a metropolitan area with one of the highest cost-of-living indexes in the country, I must point out to the House that a Federal employee in my area who receives an across-the-board pay increase identical to that of his counterpart in other sections of the country is being discriminated against.

Why should a postal carrier or clerk or classified employee in any agency of the Federal Government working in the Chicago area be limited to an identical salary of a similar employee in sections of the country where the cost of living is one-third less?

The Chicago post office was recently investigated as a result of a monstrous snafu in the delivery of Christmas mail and one of the underlying causes in the breakdown in the operations of the Chicago post office was the fact that

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

many of the new employees do not meet the tradition and the sound standards of postal employment. In contrast, in many areas of the country where lower pay scales and lower cost of living are in effect, a Federal Government position finds many applicants seeking the post.

Until we recognize the need to increase salaries of Federal employees in metropolitan areas to adjust to the cost of living, a pay bill of this nature will remain inadequate.

I hope the Members will ponder on these points which I have briefly emphasized. It is my further hope that, next year when the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee organizes, the first order of business will be to study a new pay plan to increase the salaries of employees in high cost-of-living areas such as the Chicago metropolitan region.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, as in the case of the last pay bill, I cannot support this bill. My position is simple; we must not borrow to give salary increases. First, we must have the money on hand and then we can increase pay.

So the merits of a pay boost do not enter in as an argument for the bill at this time.

I want to commend the four members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for their minority views, and I adopt them as my own.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11049.

The late, great President John F. Kennedy said a few years ago:

> Let every man and women who works in any area of our National Government, in any branch at any level, be able to say with pride and with honor in future years, "I served the U.S. Government in that hour of our Nation's need."

Because President Johnson has given a Federal pay raise the highest priority on his list of legislative musts, I know that that is the way President Johnson feels about Government service.

That is the way I feel about public service.

Yet, many of us are under attack because we are employees of the Federal Government.

I have read the stories of the wrongs done by the Members of Congress or the employees of Congress which have inferred that all of Congress is wrong; and yet I say to you that I am proud to be a Member of a legislative body which, although it has been criticized, has for the 175 years of its existence served this country well.

We are all familiar with the stories which complain of the bloated bureaucracy, the ever-increasing cost, size, and debt of Government.

As a member of the Government Operations Committee of the Congress, charged with overseeing economy and efficiency in all levels of Government, I did some checking and came up with some facts that do indeed appear to be shocking—expenditures by State and local governments have increased nearly 375 percent since World War II; Federal expeditures, 69 percent.

The failure to dispel many myths, the failure to get the true story across—these are among the reasons for the difficulty we have had with the Federal pay raise legislation.

As compared to the Federal Government, State and local governments are bigger and are growing faster, not only in total terms, but also in terms of individual salaries.

The chief of police of the city of Chicago receives $50,000 a year and yet J. Edgar Hoover, who has just completed his 40th year as head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, receives $20,000.

At the present time, a member of the Cabinet who, as Secretary, heads one of the departments which are so important to our national welfare and safety, receives $25,000 a year. Contrast this with the fact that my own State of Pennsylvania has 165 Government positions which pay more than $25,000 a year and our neighbor the State of New York, has 432 such government positions.

A recent editorial in the New York Times said:

> Those who oppose waste and extravagance in Government spending argue that raising the level of Federal salaries would be unjustified and unequitable. Yet, the biggest single cause of waste in Government and private industry is inefficient management.

General Motors Corp. is often pointed out as one of the most efficient of big business corporations. We should all be happy that General Motors recently announced the largest net earnings in its history, $536,331,704 for the quarter ended March 31, 1964.

Some of the reason for this magnificent and praiseworthy success may result from the fact that just 56 executives of General Motors draw a total salary and bonuses greater than the salaries of all the following combined: all 435 Congressmen, all 100 Senators, all the Cabinet officers, the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Supreme Court, and the Governors of the 50 States.

President Johnson certainly understands this principle. In his letter of March 17, 1964, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President said:

> Congress and the country surely support my determined drive for economy in Government. To make that policy work, I need first-class managers—who can tighten organizations, simplify procedures, trim waste, and inspire maximum effort. It is false economy to offer salaries that will attract the mediocre but repel the talented.

That is the secret of General Motors success. In this case what is good for GM will be good for the United States.

This is a national problem because the Nation needs the best possible men in the positions of top responsibility in the Government. As the New York Times said on April 30:

> The Nation has been fortunate that so many skilled people have been willing to accept the financial penalties involved in Government service. But with the pay scales and fringe benefits available to high-caliber personnel in private industry constantly rising, the Government will find it increasingly difficult to attract and keep executives with the talent and training required for formulating and carrying out policy.

This problem is acute with a number of key men in Government posts. Not only are they being pressed to accept private jobs at two or three times their Government pay, but they find themselves going into the hole each year with children to educate and the cost of Washington living constantly mounting.

Examples are: Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; Under Secretary of the Treasury, Robert Roosa; Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur Cohen; Llewellyn Thompson, principal adviser on Soviet affairs in the State Department; Hugh Dryden, Deputy Administrator of the space agency. Men in this category find themselves dropping behind at the rate of $4,000 or $5,000 a year. They can stay afloat only by borrowing.

Heller had determined to leave government at once so that he could resume his post as chairman of the economics department at the University of Minnesota. With three children reaching college age, he has maintained a home in St. Paul as well as in Washington. The President in a long and serious discussion prevailed on him to stay until November.

Thompson, whose background out of 5 years in Moscow as Ambassador is invaluable, has felt compelled to think of accepting one of the private offers coming to him. Cohen has been offered three university deanships paying more than his present job with half the work.

We must rectify this situation.

Our employers are the American people who are taxed to pay our salaries and whom we have been elected or appointed to serve.

I believe that we have a story to tell to our employers—the American people.

Our employers—the American people—are entitled to have the plain, unvarnished facts, without myths of bloated bureaucracy and gravy trains. Surely we are doing neither ourselves or the people justice if we fail to do this.

Surely this is a platform on which Government employees—management, labor, and Congress could unite.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment by titles instead of by sections.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964".

TITLE I—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY SYSTEMS

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964".

CLASSIFICATION ACT EMPLOYEES

SEC. 102. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (76 Stat. 843; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"Grade	"Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS–1	$3,385	$3,500	$3,615	$3,73	$3,845	$3,960	$4,075	$4,190	$4,305	$4,420
GS–2	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430	4,555	4,680	4,805
GS–3	4,005	4,140	4,275	4,410	4,545	4,080	4,815	4,950	5,085	5,220
GS–4	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830
GS–5	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,155	6,320	6,485
GS–6	5,505	5,690	5,875	6,060	0,245	6,430	6,615	6,800	6,985	7,170
GS–7	6,050	6,250	6,450	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250	7,450	7,650	7,850
GS–8	6,630	6,850	7,070	7,290	7,510	7,730	7,950	8,170	8,390	8,610
GS–9	7,210	7,455	7,700	7,945	8,190	8,435	8,680	8,925	9,170	9,415
GS–10	7,840	8,110	8,380	8,650	8,920	9,190	9,460	9,730	10,000	10,270
GS–11	8,550	8,845	9,140	9,435	9,730	10,025	10,320	10,615	10,910	11,205
GS–12	10,200	10,555	10,910	11,265	11,620	11,975	12,330	12,685	13,040	13,395
GS–13	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
GS–14	14,170	14,660	15,150	15,640	16,130	16,620	17,110	17,600	18,090	18,580
GS–15	16,460	17,030	17,600	18,170	18,740	19,310	19,880	20,450	21,020	21,590
GS–16	18,935	19,590	20,245	20,900	21,555	22,210	22,865	23,520	24,175	-------
GS–17	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
GS–18	24,500	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2(b) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111; Public Law 763, Eighty-third Congress), plus the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, by section 112 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960, and by section 602 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of (A) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under such section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, (B) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, (C) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, (D) the amount of the increase provided by section 112 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960, (E) the amount of the increases in schedule I and schedule II provided by section 602 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, and (F) the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (1) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purpose of section 208(b) of such Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of such employee.

(5) If the officer or employee is in a position in grade 16 or 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to which he was promoted on or after the first day of his first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, and if he holds such position, or another position in the same grade, on the effective date of this section, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted, as of such effective date, to that rate of basic compensation to which he would have been entitled if the compensation schedule in subsection (a) of this section had been in effect on the date of his promotion.

SEC. 103. (a) Section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1131), relating to new appointments, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 801. All new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade, except that in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission which provide for such considerations as the candidate's existing salary, unusually high or unique qualifications, or a special need of the Government for his services, the head of any department may appoint individuals to positions in grade 13 and above of the General Schedule at such rate or rates above the minimum rate of the appropriate grade as the Commission may authorize for this purpose.".

(b) Section 1105 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1071, note and 1082, note), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1105. The provisions of section 507, title VII, and title VIII of this Act shall not apply to professional engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and professional positions in the physical and natural sciences and medicine placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule in accordance with subsection (b) or subsection (j) of section 505 of this Act. The President or an agency or agencies that he designates shall issue regulations governing the rate of basic compensation within the grade to be received by any officer or employee occupying, appointed to, or promoted to, such a position, and, in the case of reduction in grade, may issue regulations governing retention of the rate to which the officer or employee was entitled immediately before reduction."

(c) Section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(b)), relating to the limitation on numbers of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of such Act, is amended by striking out "which may be placed in such grades" and by inserting in lieu thereof ", examiner positions under section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 244; 5 U.S.C. 1010), and positions placed under this Act pursuant to section 309 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, which may be placed in such grades".

(d) Section 604(d)(3) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 944(c)(3)), is amended to read as follows:

"(3) In the computation of rates, all remaining fractions of a cent shall be eliminated."

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 104. Section 1 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

" 'revenue unit' means that amount of revenue of a post office from mail and special service transactions which is equal to the average sum of postal rates and fees received by the Department during the fiscal year for 1,000 pieces of originating mail and special service transactions determined in accordance with section 2331 of this title.".

SEC. 105. Section 702 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 702. Classes of post offices

"(a) Effective at the beginning of each fiscal year the Postmaster General shall divide post offices into four classes on the basis of the revenue units of each office for the second preceding fiscal year. He shall place in the first class those post offices having 950 or more revenue units. He shall place in the second class those post offices having 190 or more revenue units, but less than 950 revenue units. He shall place in the third class those post offices having 36 or more revenue units, but less than 190 revenue units. He shall place in the fourth class those post offices having less than 36 revenue units.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall exclude from the revenue credited to a post office for the purposes of this section money received at that office for—

"(1) setting meters for patrons beyond the area served by the office unless authorized by the Department;

"(2) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold in large or unusual quantities to be used in mailing matter at other offices; and

"(3) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold for mailing matter diverted from other offices and mailing of matter so diverted without stamps affixed.

"(c) Whenever unusual conditions prevail at a post office of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate class based on his estimate of the number of revenue units which the office will have during the succeeding twelve months. Any office so advanced need not be relegated to a lower class before the end of the second fiscal year after the advancement. At that time, the office shall be assigned to the appropriate class in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section.".

SEC. 106. Section 704 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting "of the first, second, or third class" appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "(other than one for which the postmaster furnishes quarters, equipment, and fixtures on an allowance basis)".

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

SEC. 107. Subsection (b)(1) of section 2102 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) for post offices at which the postmaster does not furnish quarters on an allowance basis;".

SEC. 108. (a) Section 3501 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) deleting from the first sentence of subsection (a) the following: "standard positions of postmaster in a fourth class office and rural carrier" and inserting in lieu thereof "standard position of rural carrier"; and

(2) inserting a new subsection (c) following subsection (b) as follows:

"(c) As of the effective date of this section, the Postmaster General shall determine and adjust the rankings of all positions for which the number of annual revenue units of a post office or its class is a relevant factor of the ranking, using the revenue units of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and the class of the office as of July 1, 1964. Thereafter the Postmaster General shall determine and, effective at the beginning of the first pay period in each calendar year, shall adjust the rankings of all positions for which the number of annual revenue units of a post office or its class is a relevant factor of the ranking, using the revenue units of the preceding fiscal year and the class in which the office will be placed at the beginning of the next fiscal year. The Postmaster General also may adjust rankings of such positions at other times of the year based upon substantial changes in service conditions.".

(b) Chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (c) of section 3513—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST OFFICE CLERK. (KP-4)"; and

(B) Add the following new sentence to the end of paragraph (1): "This office has less than 190 revenue units annually.".

(2) In subsection (e) of section 3516—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-18)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $1,700" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 40 revenue units annually".

(3) In subsection (b) of section 3517—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-20)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $4,700" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 110 revenue units annually".

(4) In subsection (b) of section 3518—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-22)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $6,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 140 revenue units annually".

(5) In subsection (b) of section 3519—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-24)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $63,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,490 revenue units annually".

(6) In subsection (c) of section 3519—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-25)";

(B) Delete "second class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $16,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 380 revenue units annually".

(7) In subsection (b) of section 3520—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-27)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $63,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,490 revenue units annually".

(8) In subsection (b) of section 3521—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-29)";

(B) Delete "first class" appearing in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $129,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 3,060 revenue units annually".

(9) In subsection (b) of section 3522—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-31)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $314,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 7,450 revenue units annually".

(10) In subsection (b) of section 3523—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-33)";

(B) Delete "first class" appearing in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof: "This office has approximately 110 employees, approximately 14,350 revenue units annually, 13 government-owned vehicle units, one classified station and 42 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.".

(11) In subsection (b) of section 3524—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-35)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $2,700,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 64,000 revenue units annually".

(12) In subsection (c) of section 3524—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-36)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $1,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 23,700 revenue units annually".

(13) In subsection (a) of section 3525—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-37)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $8,460,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 200,000 revenue units annually".

(14) In subsection (b) of section 3525—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-38)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $2,700,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 64,000 revenue units annually".

(15) In subsection (a) of section 3526—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-39)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $16,900,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 400,000 revenue units annually".

(16) In subsection (b) of section 3526—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-40)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $4,470,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 106,000 revenue units annually".

(17) In subsection (b) of section 3527—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-42)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $48,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,000,000 revenue units annually".

(18) In subsection (c) of section 3527—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-43)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $8,460,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 200,000 revenue units annually".

(19) In subsection (b) of section 3528—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-45)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $140,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 2,500,000 revenue units annually".

(20) In subsection (c) of section 3528—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-46)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $16,900,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 400,000 revenue units annually".

(21) In section 3529—

(A) Change the catchline immediately preceding paragraph (1) to read "POSTMASTER (KP-47)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $48,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,000,000 revenue units annually".

(22) In section 3530—

(A) Change the catchline immediately preceding paragraph (1) to read "POSTMASTER (KP-48)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $140,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 2,500,000 revenue units annually".

SEC. 109. Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows—

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in section 3543 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"Postal Field Service schedule

"PFS	"Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$3,945	$4,075	$4,205	$4,335	$4,465	$4,595	$4,725	$4,855	$4,985	$5,115	$5,245	$5,375
2	4,270	4,410	4,550	4,690	4,830	4,970	5,110	5,250	5,390	5,530	5,670	5,810
3	4,615	4,770	4,925	5,080	5,235	5,390	5,545	5,700	5,855	6,010	6,165	6,320
4	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,155	6,320	6,485	6,650	6,815
5	5,345	5,525	5,705	5,885	6,065	6,245	6,425	6,605	6,785	6,965	7,145	7,325
6	5,735	5,925	6,115	6,305	6,495	6,685	6,875	7,065	7,255	7,445	7,635	7,825
7	6,140	6,345	6,550	6,755	6,960	7,165	7,370	7,575	7,780	7,985	8,190	------
8	6,650	6,870	7,090	7,310	7,530	7,750	7,970	8,190	8,410	8,630	------	------
9	7,190	7,430	7,670	7,910	8,150	8,390	8,630	8,870	9,110	9,350	------	------
10	7,830	8,095	8,360	8,625	8,890	9,155	9,420	9,685	9,950	10,215	------	------
11	8,650	8,945	9,240	9,535	9,830	10,125	10,420	10,715	11,010	11,305	------	------
12	9,570	9,895	10,220	10,545	10,870	11,195	11,520	11,845	12,170	12,495	------	------
13	10,575	10,940	11,305	11,670	12,035	12,400	12,765	13,130	13,495	13,860	------	------
14	11,660	12,065	12,470	12,875	13,280	13,685	14,090	14,495	14,900	15,305	------	------
15	12,885	13,330	13,775	14,220	14,665	15,110	15,555	16,000	16,445	16,890	------	------
16	14,240	14,735	15,230	15,725	16,220	16,715	17,210	17,705	18,200	18,695	------	------
17	15,755	16,305	16,855	17,405	17,955	18,505	19,055	19,605	20,155	20,705	------	------
18	17,450	18,060	18,670	19,280	19,890	20,500	21,110	21,720	22,330	22,940	------	------
19	19,345	20,020	20,695	21,370	22,045	22,720	23,395	24,070	------	------	------	------",
20	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

SEC. 110. Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows—

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'RCS'.

"Rural carrier schedule

	"Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carriers in rural delivery service:												
Fixed compensation per annum	$2,240	$2,345	$2,450	$2,555	$2,660	$2,765	$2,870	$2,975	$3,080	$3,185	$3,290	$3,395
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25".

SEC. 111. (a) Section 3544 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3544. Compensation of Postmasters at Fourth-Class Offices

"(a) The Postmaster General shall rank the position of postmaster of fourth-class offices in level 5 of the Postal Field Service Schedule and shall establish the annual rate of basic compensation for each such position in the proportion of the annual rate of basic compensation for positions in PFS–5 which he determines, in consideration of the postal needs of the patrons of the office, that the postmasters' hours of service bear to full-time service. Determinations made by the Postmaster General under this subsection shall be final and conclusive until changed by him.

"(b) Persons who perform the duties of postmaster at a post office of the fourth class where there is a vacancy or during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave or leave without pay shall be compensated at the rate of basic compensation for PFS level 5, step 1, determined in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) At seasonal post offices of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may authorize the payment of basic salary prorated over the pay periods the office is open for business during the fiscal year.

"(d) When required by the Postmaster General a postmaster at a fourth-class office shall, and any other postmaster in PFS level 5 when permitted by the Postmaster General may, furnish quarters, fixtures, and equipment for an office on an allowance basis. The allowance for this purpose shall be an amount equal to 15 per centum of the basic compensation for the postmaster at the office computed on the basis of the first step of PFS level 5.".

(b) In the operation of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section, the following provisions shall govern:

(1) Each postmaster at a fourth-class office on the effective date of this section shall be assigned, as of such date—

(A) to that numerical step of level 5 of the Postal Field Service Schedule (PFS–5) which corresponds to the numerical step of the Fourth-Class Office Schedule (FOS) receipts category which he occupied immediately prior to such assignment, or

(B) to the lowest step of level 5 of the Postal Field Service Schedule (PFS–5) which will provide him, for the number of hours of service determined under section 3544 of title 39, United States Code, compensation which is not less than the compensation to which he would otherwise be entitled, on the effective date of this section, under Fourth Class Schedule II (as if such schedule were in effect on such date),

whichever step provides the higher rate of compensation.

(2) If no step in level 5 of the Postal Field Service Schedule (PFS–5) will provide a postmaster, so assigned under paragraph (1) of this subsection, with compensation which is equal to or greater than the compensation which he would have received under Fourth Class Schedule II (as if such schedule were in effect on the effective date of this section), such postmaster shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the applicable rate fixed under Fourth Class Schedule II (as if such schedule were in effect on the effective date of this section) and the provisions of section 3544 of title 39, United States Code (as such provisions existed immediately prior to the effective date of this section). Subject to the provisions of section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, the compensation of a postmaster paid in accordance with the immediately preceding sentence shall be adjusted in accordance with changes in the gross postal receipts of his post office as though this Act had not been enacted. The compensation of a postmaster paid in accordance with any of the foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall continue in effect until such postmaster is entitled to receive compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law.

(3) If changes in the gross postal receipts category or changes in salary step otherwise would occur on the effective date of this section (without regard to the enactment of this section), such changes shall be held and considered to have occurred prior to assignment under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(c) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting:

"3544. Fourth Class Office Schedule.";

and inserting in lieu thereof

"3544. Compensation of Postmasters at Fourth-Class Offices.".

SEC. 112. (a) Subsection (a) of section 6007 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Postmaster General shall pay to persons, other than special delivery messengers at post offices of the first class, for making delivery of special delivery mail such fees as may be established by him not in excess of the special delivery fee.".

(b) Section 2009 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting "at any price less than eight cents per piece" and inserting in lieu thereof "at any price less than the fees established pursuant to section 6007(a) of this title.".

SEC. 113. Section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by deleting from subsection (a) "(3) gross receipts category, with respect to the Fourth-Class Office Schedule" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3) minimum hours of service with respect to postmasters in fourth-class post offices"; and

(2) by deleting from subsection (f) "(1) reductions in class or gross receipts category of any post office, or" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) reductions in class, revenue units of any post office, or the minimum hours of service for a fourth-class post office, or".

SEC. 114. Section 3552 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, the Postmaster General is authorized to advance any employee in PFS level 9 or below who—

"(1) was promoted to a higher level between July 9, 1960, and October 13, 1962; and

"(2) is senior with respect to total postal service to an employee in his own post office promoted to the same position since October 13, 1962, and is at a step in the level below the step of the junior employee.

Any increase under the provisions of this subsection shall not constitute an equivalent increase and credit earned prior to adjustment under this subsection for advancement to the next step shall be retained."

SEC. 115. (a) Section 711 of title 39, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The table of contents of chapter 7 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting

"711. Method of determining gross receipts.".

SEC. 116. (a) The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule or the Rural Carrier Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this section, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

(b) Section 3541(f) of title 39, United States Code, relating to computation of rates, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) In the computation of rates, all remaining fractions of a cent shall be eliminated.".

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 117. (a) Section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the appointment and annual salaries of certain staff positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director

"(a) The Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the following—

"(1) The Chief Medical Director, who shall be the Chief of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and shall be directly responsible to the Administrator for the operations of the Department. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Deputy Chief Medical Director, who shall be the principal assistant of the Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

"(3) Not to exceed five Assistant Chief Medical Directors, who shall be appointed by the Administrator upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director. One Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine who shall be directly responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Dental Service.

"(4) Such Medical Directors as may be appointed by the Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, to suit the needs of the Department. A Medical Director shall be either a qualified doctor of medicine or a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine.

"(5) A Director of Nursing Service, who shall be a qualified registered nurse, appointed by the Administrator, and who shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Nursing Service.

"(6) A Chief Pharmacist and a Chief Dietitian, appointed by the Administrator.

"(7) Such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by this chapter.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any appointment under this section shall be for a period of four years, with reappointment permissible for successive like periods, except that persons so appointed or reappointed shall be subject to removal by the Administrator for cause.

"(c) The Administrator may designate a member of the Chaplain Service of the Veterans' Administration as Director, Chaplain Service, for a period of two years, subject to removal by the Administrator for cause. Redesignation under this subsection may be made for successive like periods. An individual designated as Director, Chaplain Service, shall at the end of his period of service as Director revert to the position, grade, and status which he held immediately prior to being designated Director, Chaplain Service, and all service as Director, Chaplain Service, shall be creditable as service in the former position."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"4103. Appointments and compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director."

(c) Section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), shall not apply to any individual appointed, before January 1, 1964, as Chief Medical Director under section 4103 of title 38, United States Code; but section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a), shall apply, in accordance with its terms, to any such individual.

SEC. 118. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"SECTION 4103 SCHEDULE

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, $24,500.

"Medical Director, $21,445 minimum to $24,445 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Director, Chaplain Service, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"PHYSICIAN AND DENTIST SCHEDULE

"Director grade, $18,935 minimum to $24,175 maximum.

"Executive grade, $17,655 minimum to $23,190 maximum.

"Chief grade, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Senior grade, $14,170 minimum to $18,580 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $12,075 minimum to $15,855 maximum.

"Full grade, $10,200 minimum to $13,395 maximum.

"Associate grade, $3,550 minimum to $11,205 maximum.

"NURSE SCHEDULE

"Assistant Director grade, $14,170 minimum to $18,580 maximum.

"Chief grade, $12,075 minimum to $15,855 maximum.

"Senior grade, $10,200 minimum to $13,395 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $8,550 minimum to $11,205 maximum.

"Full grade, $7,210 minimum to $9,415 maximum.

"Associate grade, $6,315 minimum to $8,205 maximum.

"Junior grade, $5,505 minimum to $7,170 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position.".

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS; STAFF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 119. Section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows:

"FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

"SEC. 412. There shall be 10 classes of Foreign Service officers, including the classes of career ambassador and of career minister. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be at the rate provided by law for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be at the rate provided by law for level V of such schedule. The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$22,650	$23,440	$24,500				
Class 2	18,295	18,930	19,565	$20,200	$20,835	$21,470	$22,105
Class 3	14,860	15,375	15,890	16,405	16,920	17,435	17,950
Class 4	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595
Class 5	9,900	10,245	10,590	10,935	11,280	11,625	11,970
Class 6	8,205	8,490	8,775	9,060	9,345	9,630	9,915
Class 7	7,000	7,235	7,470	7,705	7,940	8,175	8,410
Class 8	6,050	6,250	6,450	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250".

SEC. 120. Subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There shall be ten classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees. The per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$14,860	$15,375	$15,890	$16,405	$16,920	$17,435	$17,950	$18,465	$18,980	$19,495
Class 2	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
Class 3	9,900	10,245	10,590	10,935	11,280	11,625	11,970	12,315	12,660	13,005
Class 4	8,205	8,490	8,775	9,060	9,345	9,630	9,915	10,200	10,485	10,770
Class 5	7,405	7,660	7,915	8,170	8,425	8,680	8,935	9,190	9,445	9,700
Class 6	6,710	6,935	7,160	7,385	7,610	7,835	8,060	8,285	8,510	8,735
Class 7	6,205	6,410	6,615	6,820	7,025	7,230	7,435	7,640	7,845	8,050
Class 8	5,490	5,675	5,860	6,045	6,230	6,415	6,600	6,785	6,970	7,155
Class 9	5,010	5,175	5,340	5,505	5,670	5,835	6,000	6,165	6,330	6,495
Class 10	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830".

SEC. 121. Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COUNTY COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 122. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102 of this Act for corresponding rates of

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 123. Section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 1173) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The rate of basic compensation, established under this section, and received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of a statutory increase in the compensation schedules of the salary systems specified in subsection (a) shall be initially adjusted on the effective date of such new compensation schedules in accordance with conversion rules and regulations prescribed by the President or by such agency or agencies as he may designate."

ABSORPTION OF COSTS

SEC. 124. (a) The cost of not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate amount of the increases in compensation provided by this title for the fiscal year 1965 shall be absorbed by the departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch; and no amount beyond the additional sum for such compensation increases proposed in the budget for the fiscal year 1965 is authorized to be appropriated by any provision of this Act. The total amount of such absorption shall be allocated by the Bureau of the Budget among such departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in such manner and to such extent as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget deems appropriate in the light of their essential functions.

(b) Pursuant to the objective of this section, heads of the executive branch activities concerned are directed to review with meticulous care each vacancy resulting from voluntary resignation, retirement, or death and to determine whether the duties of the position can be reassigned to other employees or whether the position can be abolished without seriously affecting the execution of essential functions.

(c) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be held or considered to require (1) the separation from the service of any individual by reduction in force or other personnel action or (2) the placing of any individual in a leave-without-pay status.

Mr. MURRAY (during the reading of title I). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of title I be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD and be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk concluded the reading of title I.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE SALARIES

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1964".

SEC. 202. (a) Each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation in an amount equal to the greater of the following amounts, as applicable:

(1) an amount equal to 3½ per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law) in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section plus 1 per centum of such gross rate for each whole multiple, or part of a multiple, of $500 basic compensation; or

(2) an amount equal to 5 per centum of such gross rate.

(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this title, shall be increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase provided by subsection (a) of this section in that gross rate which is nearest in amount to the total annual compensation of such officer or employee.

(c) Each of the limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives shall be increased by 7 per centum. The amount of each increase under this subsection shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

(e) Section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(e)), is amended—

(1) by striking out "$8,880" where it first appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,"; and

(2) by striking out "$8,880" at the second place where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(f) (1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rule making power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

(2) Clause 28(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

(A) by striking out "$8,880" where it first appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,"; and

(B) by striking out "$8,880" at the second place where it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

SEC. 203. (a) The compensation of the Comptroller General of the United States shall be at the rate of $30,000 per annum.

(b) The compensation of the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States shall be at the rate of $29,000 per annum.

(c) The compensation of the General Counsel of the United States General Accounting Office, the Librarian of Congress, the Public Printer, and the Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $28,000 per annum.

(d) The compensation of the Deputy Librarian of Congress, the Deputy Public Printer, and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $27,000 per annum.

(e) The compensation of the Second Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $26,000 per annum.

(f) The compensation of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $12,500 per annum.

SEC. 204. Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 31), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $30,000 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $43,000 per annum."

SEC. 205. No officer or employee subject to section 202(a) or 202(b) of this title shall receive, by reason of any provision of this title, an increase in gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law), or in total annual compensation, which is in excess of the amount of the increase in basic compensation provided by the amendment made by section 102(a) of title I of this Act for positions in grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Mr. MURRAY (during the reading of title II). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of title II be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD and that it be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk concluded the reading of title II.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 38, immediately following line 12, insert the following:

"SEC. 205. (a) Nothwithstanding any other provision of law and in recognition of the fact that the duties and responsibilities of a Member of Congress are conducted on a full-time basis, there shall be deducted from the compensation in any year of each Senator, Representative in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico an amount equal to the amount of compensation which such official has received for personal services from other sources during such year up to the amount of any increase provided in this Act. Personal services shall be deemed to include any personal service performed by the individual for which he receives a salary, commission, fee, retainer, honorarium, per diem, or any other compensation received in return for rendering such personal service, but shall not include dividends, interest, rentals, pensions, disability benefits, insurance, retirement income or any other form of income which is not predicated upon the rendering of any personal service."

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offered this amendment when the bill was before the House on March 12. As was to be expected, the amendment was voted down. However, after the session that day several Members came to me and said, "I did not understand what you were trying to do."

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

I shall try to make this very clear. I believe a majority of the people recognize that service as a Member of Congress should represent a full-time job, at least while Congress is in session, and that any service or obligation a Member has which would take him away from his congressional duties and which would prevent him from attending committee meetings and prevent him from being on the floor of the House—or on the floor of the other body—contributes to extending the length of the session.

Let me explain what the amendment would do. Let us presume that the bill is passed and that the salary is increased $7,500 a year. The amendment provides that any personal-service compensation or remuneration which a Member receives during the year is to be deducted from—and up to—the amount of the increased salary. This is for personal service only, predicated upon the presumption the personal service requires a person to be away from his duties here in the House. That might include a salary. It might be a commission for a sale he is making as a salesman. It might be a fee. It might be a retainer. It might be an honorarium. It might be a per diem. It would include anything that was a personal service.

If that Member during the year received, for personal services, $5,000, that $5,000 would be deducted from the $7,500 he would receive in additional salary.

The people have told us many times that the Members of Congress are underpaid, and that is the basis, I presume, upon which the committee and others who are supporting this legislation are supporting it. They say that a Member needs to have more compensation. They say a Member who lives in the Far West, in the Deep South, in the Midwest, or in another part of the country, is prevented, because of his service in the Congress—though I believe he was elected for full-time service—from being here.

I believe Members should have no hesitancy about including income from personal services, since other Members, because of their residence or because of their employment—profession, or whatever it may be—do not have an opportunity to get the additional money. I believe that would be fair.

This would put Members of Congress upon a more equitable basis so far as their income is concerned.

I wish to make one point quite clear. This would not include income from dividends, from interest, from rentals, from pensions, from disability benefits, from insurance, or from retirement income. The only thing that this would affect would be that income from personal service which takes a Member away from the House of Representatives—or from the other body, as the case might be.

My contention is this, that if all Members felt they were going to have to give up a part of this income—let us say a lawyer in Philadelphia or some other professional man who wants to be away from here every Monday or every Friday and he is not making himself available—then I think he might be inclined to be here. If this House and this Congress could stay in session for 7 months a year, as the law says it should be, then I think we could get this job done and we could adjourn by July 31, as the law provides, and we could get out of here. I think and I hope I have made myself clear. If I have not, I would be glad to answer any questions you might have on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. I cannot deny that I have a great deal of sympathy with the situation you are attempting to correct by your amendment, but as I read your amendment, I am afraid you do great violence in attempting to end an abuse.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In attempting to do what?

Mr. MOSS. In attempting to end an abuse. In the first place, you confine this exclusively to the Members of Congress. Many others are going to receive increased compensation under this legislation. They also perhaps take an honorarium and may take several in the course of a year. Yet you do not propose under this amendment to require that they return this to the Government in lieu of the increase in salary. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would say this to the gentleman, that the employees of the House of Representatives can be under the rules of the House and they could be taken care of in that manner. I think you will also find that the chairman of a committee or the officers of the House can see that the staff members or the people you are referring to in the legislative branch are taken care of.

Mr. MOSS. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MOSS. You do not cover judges or employees of the executive departments of the Government or members of the independent boards or commissions established under the authority of the Government, do you?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not cover them for this reason: I am trying to deal with a problem here. Frankly, as I have stated in the past, I do not think that the legislative branch has any business in this bill to start with, but if we are going to try to improve the legislative branch and the set-up that we have here, this should be the opportunity to do it. If you want to go and correct the others, that is all right. All I am trying to do is something that I know about here in this House and some of the practices going on with regard to some of the income, I think. You say you want to put these people on a comparable level. This would put them on a level, and they would get their $32,500 or whatever it is.

Mr. MOSS. Could we look at a hypothetical case where injustice occurs under your amendment? You have discussed the problem of those of us who are many miles removed from the Nation's Capital with our place of residence.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MOSS. I come from California.

Mr. JONES of Missouri That is right.

Mr. MOSS. Supposing in the course of a year I might have $1,000 or $1,500 in honorariums and somebody nearby the Capital would have $15,000 in honorariums. I would be forced to give up the entirety of my income from honorariums, but the other party would be required to give up only 50 percent.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. MOSS. I think you might encourage greater activity in that area rather than less.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They would also be subject to being here in the House of Representatives where their job is.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I know the gentleman is endeavoring to do something which he feels is in the interest of the Congress and of the country. However, I am not sure it will do equity, and I am not sure it will not complicate the administration of the act. What about persons owning many properties who have managerial responsibilities which keep them away from Congress? It is difficult to say whether this would be personal service or not, but it would involve their personal time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. There is nothing wrong about it, Mr. ALBERT, except that I think this: We have a responsibility to be here when the Congress is in session. I think an amendment of this kind would be conducive to keeping a quorum here so that we would not have the Tuesday to Thursday Club operating.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's amendment would be discriminatory as between someone who performs a personal service for someone else and someone who had important managerial responsibilities connected, say, with his own business.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think it is easy to find excuses why we could not do this. But I think this would at least make a start to keep people here on the job. I would be glad to hear from someone who would take the position that being a Member of Congress is not a full-time job while Congress is in session.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I believe one of the defects of the gentleman's amendment is that the language is not clear. For example, while I am from the city of Pittsburgh I also run a sheep ranch. Farming is within the scope of a personal service, although I am not out there doing the work. But I must say that if the farmers of this House are going to be eliminated from farming for most of the year while Congress is in session you are not going to get very many votes for this amendment.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not think they would be eliminated. In other words, each Member here makes out an income tax return, or I presume he does. And then he shows personal service on that income tax return, if he had any. I do not say this will make everybody pure. I do not think it is going to compel everybody to make out a correct income tax return, but at least it will lead toward that end.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 13, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 37, lines 20 through 25, and on page 38, lines 1 through 3, strike out all of section 204 and add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 31) is amended by adding the following:

"'(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and in recognition of the full-time responsibilities of Senators, Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner, each such official in addition to the compensation provided above, shall receive from the first day of January until the thirty-first day of July each year the sum of $50 for each day that he is actually in Washington, D.C., available for attendance at committee meetings or during sessions of the House or Senate as the case may be when such legislative body is in session. On and after July 31 of each year, the compensation of each such official shall be reduced in the amount of $50 for each day that he is not actually in attendance in the House or Senate as the case may be when such legislative body is in session and during the session of Congress; *Provided,* That such official shall be deemed to be present, for the purposes of this Act if he or she is confined to a hospital, or is confined to his or her bed under the daily care of a physician who will certify to such fact; and *Provided further,* That such official shall be deemed to be present on Sundays and legal holidays when the body of Congress of which he or she is a Member is not in session, as well as those days when that body is in official recess.'"

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is based on a per diem. It is based on a per diem in addition to the present salary.

Mr. Chairman, Congress can complete its work by July 31, as the law sets out, and during those days, from January 1 until the 31st day of July of each year, the Member who is then in Washington and available for attendance here in the House of Representatives shall receive in addition to his regular compensation $50 a day as a per diem.

Mr. Chairman, some State legislatures use this form of payment and it has been found to increase atendance, and this will make members available on all days that the House is in session. After July 31 there would be a penalty for the days that a Member is absent from Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment offers an incentive and it also provides a penalty. The incentive would be comparable to the proposed increase under the present bill. If a Member comes to Washington and makes himself available during the time Congress is in session, from January 1 through July 31, he would receive the equivalent amount of money that he would receive under this bill. After July 31 he would be penalized.

Mr. Chairman, I am not very optimistic but at least I would like to see a vote on this amendment and see if anyone is interested in cutting out the "Tuesday-to-Thursday Club."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RHODES OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania: On page 38, immediately following line 12, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 206. Notwithstanding any other provision of law and in recognition of the fact that the duties and responsibilities of Members of Congress are conducted solely as representatives of the public, each Member of the Congress and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall, on or before the 15th day of April of each year beginning with the year 1965, submit to the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate, as the case may be, a statement consisting of a full and complete disclosure of the amount or amounts of all compensation and incomes which such Member or Resident Commissioner shall have received, during the immediately preceding calendar year, from any source or sources, other than compensation or incomes received by him for or in connection with his service as such Member or Resident Commissioner in the Congress as provided by law. Such statements filed with the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate, as the case may be, and any related information filed therewith, shall be held by the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate as matters of public record and shall be available for public access thereto at any time during the regular business hours of the Office of the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate, as the case may be."

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, my amendment for compulsory public disclosure of assets and income of Members of Congress, if adopted, will make it less difficult for many Members to support the pay legislation now under consideration.

Public disclosure of assets and income may be objectionable to some but it would protect most Members against unfair criticism which has been leveled against the Congress, and which casts a cloud of suspicion on every Member of the House and Senate.

A detailed statement of this type would inform citizens of some of the financial problems faced by many Members, particularly those of us who must depend on their congressional pay to make ends meet.

It seems to me that this amendment would receive much popular support and, if adopted, would expose many of the efforts that are made to discredit the Congress. By distorting the congressional pay issue, political opponents can use the issue to confuse the voters and take the minds of the people off of important legislation that affects the national interest and the welfare of the average citizen.

Much of the opposition to congressional pay comes from citizens who feel that Congress has been negligent in not enacting legislation which is essential in increasing the opportunities and lifting the living standards of the millions of our fellow citizens who are not properly sharing in our Nation's abundance and increasing productivity.

They are looking to the Congress for legislation to boost social security benefits, and to broaden the program to include medical care for the aged. They are interested in the kind of legislation that would help bring about a better balance in our topheavy economy. Such legislation as proposed to increase income tax exemptions to $800 or $1,000, and a pension for World War I veterans, which would give needed purchasing power to those who need it most. It would give them a better share in the abundance with which this Nation is blessed. It would help ease the problems caused by automation and unemployment.

President Johnson's effort to strike at social injustice with his antipoverty program is an important step in this direction. Because of the President's concern about needless human distress and his efforts to help our senior citizens, the jobless, and other needy citizens, his proposal for improved Federal pay legislation is consistent and contains much merit.

The President's request for salary adjustments is in line with his efforts to recruit special talent, which is difficult to secure with salaries much lower than those outside the Federal service.

It is a privilege, Mr. Chairman, to serve as a Member of this House. This is more compensating than any monetary reward. I realize, however, that with heavy expenses of House Members and the cost of election campaigns, it becomes increasingly difficult for persons of moderate means to be elected to this important body. This is especially true of Members who support liberal and progressive legislation and who must often face a hostile press and heavy campaign contributions to their opponents from wealthy individuals and groups.

Personally, I would prefer if the pay raise for Members of Congress would be separated from this Federal pay increase bill, regardless of the case that can be made for the raise for Members of Congress.

There are many talented and devoted people in the Federal service who, at a financial sacrifice to themselves, are making an important contribution to our country. Many are scientists, researchers, physicians, and other professional people. I also feel that this legislation is important to conscientious and dedicated postal employees and other Federal

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

workers, particularly those in the lower paid brackets. It is for that reason that I hope this amendment will be adopted, which I believe will assure the enactment of this Federal pay bill.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. What the gentleman seeks to do is to open up the income tax forms of Members of Congress to the public. Could not that be done by legislation which would attain that purpose by separate legislation?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I would have no objection to that.

Mr. PILLION. They would be separated from everyone else, and we alone would have to make public our income tax statements.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. Chairman, worthy as the purpose of the gentleman who introduced this amendment may be, it seems to me it has no place in a salary bill. We are attempting to make salaries of governmental employees comparable to those in private industry. We are not inquiring into the financial resources of the Members of Congress. If the gentleman has this in mind, he should introduce separate legislation, it should be fully debated, hearings should be held, and then the question should be decided.

So I urge that this amendment be voted down. I question very much whether it is even germane, but no point of order was raised so it is too late for that. But in fact, the judgment of this House should not be taken on a matter so quickly. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to take a moment to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for what I think is an excellent proposal. I know these kinds of proposals have been submitted to the Congress year after year. I also know the practical difficulty of bringing these proposals out onto the floor. I do believe the amendment as offered is germane and is relevant. We are asking through this bill for an increase in congressional salaries, one that I think is merited, but at the same time, I believe the public would gain more confidence in the discharge of the representational duties of a Congressman if he were prepared to make a full disclosure of his sources of income.

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LATTA: On page 34, line 5, strike out all of title II, and renumber the succeeding titles.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I expect to oppose this administration-supported salary increase bill for the same reasons that I opposed it when it was defeated on March 12, 1964. The bill presently before us contains increases for Members of Congress, members of the Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, and other Government employees in the upper pay brackets just as did the bill previously defeated. Reducing these salary increases by approximately one-fourth still does not remove my objections to them. I am opposed to any increases for these offices and particularly to the proposed increase for Members of Congress. As I informed this House on March 12, I am satisfied with the salary I have been receiving. Second, the proposed increase is more than the annual income of most families in my district. Third, I feel that we should not be borrowing money to increase salaries. It seems perfectly ridiculous to me to pass a $533 million salary increase bill today and then vote to increase the debt limit next week to $324 billion. I do not subscribe to this new fiscal philosophy that the way to keep from going in debt is to spend more money.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent here today that the administration has changed enough votes to pass this bill. I shall, therefore, attempt to delete as many titles from the bill as possible. For this reason, I have offered the pending amendment to delete all of title II—Federal legislative salaries—from the bill. If my amendment to delete these congressional salaries from the bill is successful, I shall offer further amendments to strike title III, Federal executive salaries; and title IV, Federal judicial salaries; from the bill.

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARRY

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRY: Page 37, line 20, strike out section 204.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to give those Members who oppose getting this salary increase next January an opportunity to strike this section from the bill. There has been a great deal said about the irresponsibility of Congress in passing a tax cut and having a $10 billion excess of appropriations over income and in the same session voting themselves a pay raise. This amendment knocks out the congressional salary increase provisions of this bill. I do not think it needs further debate as far as I am concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—FEDERAL EXECUTIVE SALARIES

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964".

SEC. 302. There is hereby established for offices and position to which section 303 of this title applies a basic compensation schedule, to be known as the "Federal Executive Salary Schedule", which shall be divided into six salary levels.

SEC. 303. (a) Level I of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $32,500:

(1) Secretary of State.
(2) Secretary of the Treasury.
(3) Secretary of Defense.
(4) Attorney General.
(5) Postmaster General.
(6) Secretary of the Interior.
(7) Secretary of Agriculture.
(8) Secretary of Commerce.
(9) Secretary of Labor.
(10) Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) Level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $30,000:

(1) Deputy Secretary of Defense.
(2) Under Secretary of State.
(3) Administrator, Agency for International Development.
(4) Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
(5) Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
(6) Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.
(7) Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.
(8) Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.
(9) Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
(10) Director of the Bureau of the Budget.
(11) Director of the Office of Science and Technology.
(12) Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
(13) Director of the United States Information Agency.
(14) Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.
(15) Director of Central Intelligence.

(c) Level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $29,000:

(1) Deputy Attorney General.
(2) Deputy Postmaster General.
(3) Under Secretary of Agriculture.
(4) Under Secretary of Commerce.
(5) Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.
(6) Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.
(7) Under Secretary of the Interior.
(8) Under Secretary of Labor.
(9) Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs or Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.
(10) Under Secretary of the Treasury.
(11) Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.
(12) Secretary of the Air Force.
(13) Secretary of the Army.
(14) Secretary of the Navy.
(15) Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.
(16) Administrator of General Services.
(17) Administrator of the Small Business Administration.
(18) Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
(19) Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development.
(20) Chairman of the National Mediation Board.
(21) Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

(22) Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission.
(23) Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board.
(24) Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.
(25) Chairman, Board of Directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
(26) Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
(27) Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission.
(28) Chairman, Federal Power Commission.
(29) Chairman, Federal Trade Commission.
(30) Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission.
(31) Chairman, National Labor Relations Board.
(32) Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.
(33) Chairman, Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.
(34) Comptroller of the Currency.
(35) Commissioner of Internal Revenue.
(36) Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense.
(37) Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
(38) Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.
(39) Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.
(40) Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.
(41) Director of the Peace Corps.
(42) Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.
(43) Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.
(44) Members, Atomic Energy Commission.
(45) Members, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
(46) Members, Council of Economic Advisers.
(47) Director of National Science Foundation.
(48) Deputy Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.
(49) President, Export-Import Bank of Washington.

(d) The President is authorized from time to time to place offices and positions in levels IV, V, and VI of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule in accordance with subsections (e), (f), and (g) of this section. Each such action shall be published in the Federal Register, except when it is determined by the President that such publication would be contrary to the interest of national security.

(e) Offices and positions which the President is authorized to place in level IV include assistant secretaries of executive and military departments, general counsels of executive departments, members of regulatory boards and commissions, deputy heads of large agencies, heads of certain agencies and bureaus, and such other offices and positions the duties and responsibilities of which he deems appropriate for this level. The annual rate of basic compensation of such offices and positions shall be $28,000.

(f) Offices and positions which the President is authorized to place in level V include heads of principal services and such other offices and positions the duties and responsibilities of which he deems appropriate for this level. The annual rate of basic compensation of such offices and positions shall be $27,000.

(g) Offices and positions which the President is authorized to place in level VI include heads and board members of smaller agencies, deputy heads of other agencies, and such other offices and positions the duties and responsibilities of which he deems appropriate for this level. The annual rate of basic compensation for such offices and positions shall be $26,000.

(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the members (other than the Chairman or President, as applicable, or the Comptroller of the Currency in his capacity as a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation) of each of the boards and commissions, the Chairman or President of which is placed in level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule by subsection (c) of this section, shall be placed in level IV of such schedule.

SEC. 304. (a) Section 104 of title 3, United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President), is amended by striking out "$35,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$43,000".

(b) Section 105 of title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 105. Compensation of secretaries and executive, administrative, and staff assistants to President

"The President is authorized to fix the compensation of the six administrative assistants authorized to be appointed under section 106 of this title, of the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, and of eight other secretaries or other immediate staff assistants in the White House Office at rates of compensation not to exceed that of level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.".

Conforming changes in existing law

SEC. 305. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) The Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2201–2209), establishing rates of basic compensation for heads of executive departments and other Federal officials.

(2) Section 3012(h) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Army.

(3) Section 3013(b) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the annual salaries of the Under Secretary and each Assistant Secretary of the Army at $20,000 a year.

(4) Section 5031(d) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Navy.

(5) Section 5033(c) of title 10, United States Code, providing the annual salary of $20,000 a year for the Under Secretary of the Navy.

(6) Section 304 of Public Law 87–651, approved September 7, 1962 (76 Stat. 526; 10 U.S.C. 5094, note), providing compensation of $20,000 a year for Assistant Secretaries of the Navy.

(7) Section 8012(g) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Air Force.

(8) Section 8013(b) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the annual salaries of the Under Secretary and each Assistant Secretary of the Air Force at $20,000 a year.

(9) Section 137(c) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the compensation of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense at the rate prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments.

(10)(A) The last sentence of section 22 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 924; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2032(a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of such Commission, which reads: "Each member, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 per annum; and the member designated as Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 27 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2037(a)), relating to the salary of the Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for an Assistant Secretary of Defense".

(11) That part of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1958 (72 Stat. 1799 and 861; 75 Stat. 630; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note)—

(A) In section 2(b), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments";

(B) In section 2(c), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Director of such Office, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the under secretaries referred to in section 104 of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 (5 U.S.C. 2203),"; and

(C) In section 2(d) relating to the annual salaries of three Assistant Directors of such Office, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments,".

(12)(A) That part of the second sentence of section 202(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2472(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 202(b) of such Act (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2472(b), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Administration, which reads: ", shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,500 per annum,".

(13)(A) That part of section 201(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)), relating to the annual salary of a civilian executive secretary in the National Aeronautics and Space Council, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 a year".

(B) That part of section 204 of such Act (72 Stat. 431, 432; 42 U.S.C. 2474(a)(1), and (d)), relating to the annual salary of the Chairman of the Civilian-Military Liaison Committee, as follows:

In subsection (a)(1), that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation (in the manner provided in subsection (d)) at the rate of $20,000 per annum".

In the second sentence of subsection (d), that part which reads: "fixed by subsection (a)(1)".

(14)(A) That part of the second sentence of section 2(a) of the Act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U.S.C. 151b(a)) as amended, relating to the rank and salary of the Counselor and of the Legal Adviser of the Department of State, which reads: "and shall receive the same salary as".

(B) The last sentence of section 2(a) of the Act of May 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 111; 5 U.S.C. 151b(a)) as amended, relating to the rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Under Secretaries of State, which reads: "Unless otherwise provided for by law, the rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Under Secretaries of State shall be the same as that of Assistant Secretaries of State.".

(C) That part of the second sentence of section 2(b) of the Act of May 26, 1949, as amended (73 Stat. 265; 5 U.S.C. 151b(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs or for Economic Affairs, as designated by the President, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 a year and".

(15) The last sentence of section 210(a) of title 38, United States Code, relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration,

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

which reads: "He shall receive a salary of $21,000 a year, payable monthly.".

(16)(A) The last sentence of section 201 (a)(2) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 741; 49 U.S.C. 1321(a)(2)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which reads: "Each member of the Board shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum, except that the member serving as Chairman shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,500 per annum.".

(B) That part of the second sentence of section 301(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 744; 49 U.S.C. 1341(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum".

(C) That part of the second sentence of section 302(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 744; 49 U.S.C. 1342(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Agency, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum, and".

(17)(A) The last sentence of section 22 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2562), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which reads: "He shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.".

(B) The second sentence of section 23 of such Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2563), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Director of such Agency, which reads: "He shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,500 per annum.".

(C) The second sentence of section 24 of such Act (75 Stat. 632; 22 U.S.C. 2564), relating to the annual salaries of the four Assistant Directors of such Agency, which reads: "They shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum.".

(18) Section 3 of the Act of March 2, 1955 (69 Stat. 10; 5 U.S.C. 294, 293, 295a), relating to the annual salaries of certain officials of the Department of Justice, which reads:

"SEC. 3. (a) The compensation of the Deputy Attorney General shall be at the rate of $21,000 per annum.

"(b) The compensation of the Solicitor General shall be at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

"(c) The compensation of each Assistant Attorney General, other than the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum.".

(19)(A) The last sentence of section 103 (c) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 7 of 1961 (75 Stat. 840; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15, note), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of the Federal Maritime Commission, which reads: "The Chairman of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,500 per annum, and each of the other Commissioners shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum.".

(B) That part of section 201 of such reorganization plan (75 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15, note), relating to the annual salary of the Maritime Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum,".

(20) That part of the fourth sentence of section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (74 Stat. 408 and 913; 15 U.S.C. 78d(a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and Commissioners of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which reads: "shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 a year, except that the Chairman shall receive additional salary at the rate of $500 a year and".

(21) Section 8 of the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 (72 Stat. 1789; 5 U.S.C. 2 305, note), fixing the annual salary of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs at $20,000 per annum.

(22) That part of the first sentence of section 3 of the Area Redevelopment Act (75 Stat. 48; 42 U.S.C. 2502), relating to the annual salary of the Area Redevelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "who shall receive compensation at a rate eqaul to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce".

(23) The last sentence of section 203(b) (1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (72 Stat. 520; 5 U.S.C. 171c(b)(1)), relating to the annual salary of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, which reads: "The compensation of the Director is that prescribed by law for the Secretaries of the military departments.".

(24) In section 303(a) of title 23, United States Code,

(A) That part of the second sentence, relating to the annual salary of the Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "shall receive basic compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments and"; and

(B) The last sentence, relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Federal Highway Administrator in such department, which reads: "The Deputy Federal Highway Administrator shall receive basic compensation at a rate $1,000 less than the rate provided for the Federal Highway Administrator.".

(25) The last proviso in the paragraph under the heading "IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE" and under the subheading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 251; 5 U.S.C. 2206, note), relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which reads: ": *Provided further*, That, hereafter, the compensation of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be $20,000 per annum".

(26) The second paragraph of section 3 of title 35, United States Code, relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of Patents which reads: "The annual rate of compensation of the Commissioner shall be $20,000.".

(27) That part of section 4(a) of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612; 22 U.S.C. 2503 (a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Director and of the Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, which reads: ", whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $20,000 per annum," and ", whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $19,500 per annum".

(28)(A) Section 308 of title 39, United States Code, fixing the annual rate of basic compensation of the position of Chief Postal Inspector in the Post Office Department at $19,000.

(B) That part of the table of contents of chapter 3 of title 39, United States Code, which reads as follows:

"308. Chief Postal Inspector.".

(29) That part of the first sentence of section 4 of the International Travel Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 130; 22 U.S.C. 2124), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the United States Travel Service in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "who shall be compensated at the rate of $19,000 per annum,".

(30) Section 14(b) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 716; 5 U.S.C. 3013(b)), which fixes the compensation of the Executive Director of the United States Civil Service Commission at $19,000 per annum.

(31) That part of the first sentence of section 107(c) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (73 Stat. 211; 50 U.S.C. App. 1217(c)), relating to the annual salary of the General Counsel of the Renegotiation Board, which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at the rate of $19,000 per annum".

(32)(A) That part of the third sentence in section 201(a) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 538; 40 U.S.C. 661(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency, which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the maximum rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, plus $500 per annum".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 201(b) of such Act (74 Stat. 538; 40 U.S.C. 661(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Agency, which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the maximum rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(33) The last sentence of section 624(d) (1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 447; 22 U.S.C. 2384(d)(1)), as amended, fixing the compensation of certain officials in the Department of State, which reads: "The Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 annually; the Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 annually, and each Assistant Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $19,000 annually.".

(34) That part of section 202 of the Act of July 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 305; 5 U.S.C. 623g), relating to the annual salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which reads: ", and whose annual rate of basic compensation shall be $19,000".

(35) That part of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1963, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR" and under the caption "BUREAU OF RECLAMATION" and the subheading "ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS" (76 Stat. 1223; 43 U.S.C. 373a-1), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, which reads:

"After September 30, 1962, the position of Commissioner of Reclamation shall have the annual rate of compensation as provided for positions listed in section 2205(a) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent.".

(36) That part of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1962, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR" and under the caption "BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION" and the subheading "CONSTRUCTION" (75 Stat. 728; 16 U.S.C. 832a-1), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, which reads:

"After October 1, 1961, the position of Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, shall have the same annual rate of compensation as that provided for positions listed in section 2205(b) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent.".

(37) Section 205 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 423; 5 U.S.C. 483-1 note, 2206 note), as amended, relating to the salary of the present incumbent of the position of Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the Department of the Interior, and to the salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of such Department, which reads:

"SEC. 205. After August 31, 1957, the salary of the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration shall be the same as the salary of the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, so long as held by the present incumbent; and the salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Department shall be the same as the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.".

(38) The proviso in the first paragraph under the heading "FEDERAL BUREAU OF IN-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

VESTIGATION" and under the subheading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1964 (77 Stat. 782; Public Law 88–245), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which reads: ": *Provided*, That the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be $22,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent" and provisions to the same effect contained in other appropriation Acts enacted prior to the effective date of this section relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(39) That part of section 7801(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, relating to the annual salary of the Assistant General Counsel of the Treasury Department who shall be the Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, which reads: "and shall receive basic compensation at the annual rate of $19,000".

(40) (A) Sections 3018, 5014, and 8018 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the general counsels of the military departments.

(B) The respective tables of contents of chapters 303, 503, and 803 of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking out

"3018. Compensation of General Counsel.";
"5014. Compensation of General Counsel."; and
"8018. Compensation of General Counsel.".

(41) The proviso contained in the first sentence of section 5(d) of the Farm Credit Act of 1953, as amended (75 Stat. 793; 12 U.S.C. 636d(d)), relating to the annual salaries for not more than three positions of deputy governor each shall be fixed by the istration, which reads: ": *Provided*, That the salary of not more than three positions of deputy governor each shall be fixed by the Board at a rate not exceeding the maximum scheduled rate of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(42)(A) That part of section 2(a) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1962 (76 Stat. 1253; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the compensation of the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum".

(B) That part of section 2(b) of such reorganization plan (76 Stat. 1253; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the compensation of the Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, which reads: "and receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum".

(C) That part of section 22(a) of such reorganization plan (76 Stat. 1255; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the compensation of the Director of the National Science Foundation, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,000 per annum and".

(43) That part of section 624(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 447; 22 U.S.C. 2384(a)), relating to the compensation of twelve officers in the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of such Act, which reads: "of whom—

"(1) one shall have the rank of an Under Secretary and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Under Secretary of an Executive Department;

"(2) one shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretary and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate atuhorized by law for any Deputy Under Secretary of an Executive Department; and

"(3) ten shall have the rank of Assistant Secretaries and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Assistant Secretary of an Executive Department,".

(44) That part of the first sentence of section 104(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 174; 8 U.S.C. 1104(b)), relating to the rank and compensation of the Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, which reads: "and compensation".

SEC. 306. (a)(1) Section 508 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

§ 508. Salaries.

"Subject to subsection (d) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, the Attorney General shall fix the annual salaries of United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title at rates of compensation not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.".

(2) Subject to sections 303(d) and 501 (a) and (c) of this Act, each incumbent United States attorney and assistant United States attorney shall be paid compensation at a rate equal to that of attorneys of comparable responsibility and professional qualifications, as determined by the Attorney General, whose compensation is prescribed in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) Section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (70 Stat. 704; 22 U.S.C. 866), relating to the per annum salaries of chiefs of mission, is amended by striking out the second sentence of that section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The per annum salaries of chiefs of mission within each class shall be at the rate provided by law for the levels of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule as follows: class 1, the rate for level II; class 2, the rate for level III; class 3, the rate for level IV; and class 4, the rate for level V.".

(c) That part of section 201(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)), fixing a limit of $19,000 on the compensation of seven persons in the National Aeronautics and Space Council, is amended by striking out "compensated at the rate of not more than $19,000 a year," and inserting in lieu thereof "compensated at not to exceed the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,".

(d) Clause (A) of section 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)), as amended, is amended to read as follows: (A) to the extent the Administrator deems such action necessary to the discharge of his responsibilities, he may appoint not more than four hundred and twenty-five of the scientific, engineering, and administrative personnel of the Administration without regard to such laws, and may fix the compensation of such personnel not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and".

(e) Section 6(f) of the Act of September 24, 1959 (73 Stat. 706; 5 U.S.C. 2376(f)), relating to the maximum compensation payable to employees of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, is amended by striking out "at a rate in excess of $20,000 per annum" and by inserting in lieu thereof "at a rate in excess of the rate provided by law for level VI of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule".

(f) The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) In the last sentence of section 24 a. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(a)), relating to the annual salary of the General Manager of such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the Commission" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $22,000 per annum";

(2) In the last sentence of section 24 b. (71 Stat. 612, 42 U.S.C. 2034(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy General Manager of such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the General Manager" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $20,500 per annum";

(3) In the last sentence of section 24 c. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(c)), relating to the annual salaries of the Assistant General Managers (or their equivalents) of such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the General Manager" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $20,000 per annum";

(4) In the second sentence of section 25 a. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(a)), relating to the annual salaries of directors of program divisions of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum";

(5) In section 25 b. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(b)), relating to the annual salary of the General Counsel of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,500 per annum";

(6) In the first sentence of section 25 c. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(c)), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the Inspection Division in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum";

(7) In the last sentence of section 25 d. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(d)), relating to the annual salaries of certain executive management positions in such Commission, (A) by inserting "and" immediately before "shall be removable by the General Manager" and (B) by striking out that part which reads: "; and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum"; and

(8) In the second sentence of section 28 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2038), relating to the compensation of the active member of the Armed Forces serving as Director of the Division of Military Application in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads "and the compensation prescribed in section 25" and inserting in lieu thereof, "and the compensation for directors of other program divisions".

(g) Section 2 of the Act of July 30, 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 712; 70 Stat. 740; 22 U.S.C. 287n), relating to the compensation of the United States representatives and alternates at sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, is amended by striking out "Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at such rates, not to exceed $15,000 per annum, as the President may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof "Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at such rates provided by section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, as the President may determine,".

(h) Section 2 of the Act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 215; 22 U.S.C. 289a), relating to the compensation of the United States representatives and alternates at sessions of the general council and at sessions of the executive committee of the International Refugee

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Organization, is amended by striking out "Such representative or representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum, and any such alternate shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $10,000 per annum," and inserting in lieu thereof "Such representative or representatives, and any such alternate, shall be entitled to receive compensation at one of the rates provided by section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended."

(i) The third sentence of section 2 of the Act of May 29, 1959 (73 Stat. 63; 50 U.S.C. 402, note), is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, no officer or employee of the National Security Agency shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of the highest rate of basic compensation contained in such General Schedule.".

(j)(1) Sections 2 and 3 of the Act of July 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 414; D.C. Code, secs. 1–204a and 1–204b), relating to the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided by this section and section 3 of this Act—

"(1) the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $26,500 each per annum; and

"(2) the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall receive an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) the compensation of the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $27,000 per annum; and

"(2) if the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army is chosen President of the Board of Commissioners, he shall receive, as President of the Board, an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section.".

(2) Section 11–702(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 484; Public Law 88–241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, is amended—

(A) by striking out "$19,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$26,000"; and

(B) by striking out "$18,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,500".

(3) Section 11–902(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 487; Public Law 88–241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, is amended—

(A) by striking out "$18,000" and inserting in lieu there "$25,000"; and

(B) by striking out "$17,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$24,500".

(4) The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2402), relating to the compensation of the person appointed to the District of Columbia Tax Court, is amended by striking out "$17,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$24,500".

(5) That part of the salary schedule in section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (76 Stat. 1229; D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501), relating to the compensation of the Superintendent of Schools, and Deputy Superintendent of Schools, of the District of Columbia, which reads:

"Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$19,000							
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent	16,500							".

is amended to read as follows:

"Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$26,000							
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent	22,000							".

(6) That part of the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 480), as amended (sec. 4–828, et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 edition), relating to the compensation of the Fire Chief and Chief of Police, which reads:

"Class 10	17,000	17,400	17,800	18,200			18,600	19,000
Fire Chief.								
Chief of Police."								

is amended to read as follows:

"Class 10	21,000	21,500	22,000	22,500			23,000	23,500
Fire Chief.								
Chief of Police."								

(k)(1) The catchline of section 3012 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out ";compensation".

(2) The table of contents of chapter 303 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"3012. Secretary of the Army: powers and duties; delegation by; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"3012. Secretary of the Army: powers and duties; delegation by.".

(3) The catchline of section 5031 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(4) The table of contents of chapter 505 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"5031. Secretary of the Navy: responsibilities; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"5031. Secretary of the Navy: responsibilities.".

(5) The catchline of section 5033 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(6) The table of contents of chapter 505 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"5033. Under Secretary of the Navy: appointment; duties; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"5033. Under Secretary of the Navy: appointment; duties.".

(7) The catchline of section 8012 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(8) The table of contents of chapter 803 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers and duties; delegation by; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers and duties; delegation by.".

CHANGES IN POSITION TITLES

SEC. 307. Whenever reference is made in any law or reorganization plan to the—

Administrative Assistant Attorney General,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Labor,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury,

or

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,

such reference shall be held and considered to mean the

Assistant Attorney General for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of Labor for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Administration, or

Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Administration,

respectively.

LIMITATION ON SALARIES FIXED BY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

SEC. 308. Except as provided by this Act and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the head of any executive department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch who is authorized to fix by administrative action the annual rate of basic compensation for any position, officer, or employee shall not fix such rate in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to impair the authorities provided in the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended (50 U.S.C. 403a and following), in section 3 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831b), in section 9 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1819), or in section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 481, relating to the Comptroller of the Currency).

POSITIONS PLACED UNDER CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

SEC. 309. Each office or position in the executive branch specifically referred to in, or covered by, any conforming change in law made by section 305 of this Act which is not placed in a level of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule pursuant to section 303 of this Act, shall be placed in the appropriate grade of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in accordance with the provisions of such Act.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 310. (a) Except as provided by this Act, the changes in existing law made by this Act shall not affect any office or position existing immediately prior to the effective date of any such changes in existing law, the compensation attached to such office or position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his entitlement to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken in accordance with this Act or other law.

(b) Nothwithstanding any provision of this Act, the rate of basic, gross, or total annual compensation received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall not be reduced by reason of enactment of this Act.

Mr. MURRAY (during the reading of title III). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of title III be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk concluded the reading of title III.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOHANSEN

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHANSEN: On page 67, line 20, strike out all of subsection (j) down through the material which follows line 11 on page 70; and on page 70, line 12, strike out "(k)" and insert in lieu thereof "(j)".

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to eliminate all of the officials of the municipal government of the District of Columbia from the provisions of this bill.

I direct your attention first of all to the fact that this is a provision of the bill and a provision that was added to this bill which not only was not included in the March 12 bill but which was specifically rejected on March 12 when it was offered as an amendment.

It is completely true that since March 12 hearings were held on this subject matter by the Committee on the District of Columbia, but this bill comes to the floor of the House today under the sponsorship and under the aegis of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

This is one of the features of this bill which as a result of the ramrod and railroad procedures followed in the committee was not a subject of any hearings or any testimony nor was there any opportunity for discussion.

I would like to point out a further fact with respect to this provision in this subsection of the bill. Here is an area in which the principle of comparability can be reduced to as near an exact science as any segment or any section of this entire bill. What happens to comparability under these provisions?

I invite the attention of the House, and I am going to read some extracts from page 7 of the minority views. I point out the fact that the District officials in many instances are now above comparability and that this section of the bill would aggravate and would add to and further distort the excessive comparability that is involved.

Consider the matter of the District of Columbia Commissioners who would be paid $7,500 a year more or a salary of $26,500 under this bill. They would receive more compensation than the mayors in 16 out of the 21 largest cities in the United States with only 4 cities paying their mayors higher salaries.

The District of Columbia Police Chief who now earns a salary or can earn a salary up to $19,000 a year is presently the eighth highest paid police chief in all cities in the United States of over one-half million population. If the salary is raised to a maximum of $23,500, as provided in this section, only the police chiefs in Chicago and New York and Los Angeles will be paid more.

The District of Columbia Fire Chief fares even better. His present maximum salary of $19,000 makes him the sixth highest paid fire chief in all cities of over 500,000 population. If his salary is permitted to go to a maximum of $23,500, as provided in this section, he will be the third highest paid fire chief in the United States, outranked only by the fire chiefs in Chicago and Los Angeles.

This is comparability with a vengeance, I submit to my colleagues.

Listen also to this. The judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions at their present salary of $17,500 now earn more money than the judges in comparable general trial courts in 25 of our States.

I invite the attention of the committee to this—we have been talking about comparability, the kind that has a half-billion-dollar leeway one way or the other.

If the salaries of the judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions are increased, as proposed in this bill, to $24,500, they will be receiving more money than comparable judges in 44 of our States.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this provision affects fewer than 31 people in the District of Columbia. The 3 Commissioners, 23 judges, 2 school superintendents, the chief of police, and the fire chief. The total cost will be less than $200,000.

The chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House states that his committee held extensive hearings on these increases, and I should like to yield to him at this time.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana yielding to me for a few minutes.

I wish to say that there has been great confusion in the District of Columbia since the pay raise bill of two years ago was passed. At the present time there are five clerks in the District of Columbia who receive more salary than the District Commissioners. This is a bad situation and the fault of the House of Representatives, since the salary increase bill passed 2 years ago by the House increased the salaries of the clerks to rates higher than the District Commissioners salary.

We have only three District Commissioners and they are supposed to be the head of the District of Columbia executive branch of the Government. It was my understanding that when this form of government was created approximately 100 years ago the Commissioners were to be the chief executives and to receive the highest salaries paid any employees in the executive branch of the District Government.

I may state that some of us do not agree with everything or all the regulations issued by the Commissioners. Some of us do not agree with all the decisions rendered by the judges in the District. If we are to have good judges and good commissioners we should take care of this situation by accepting this provision of the pay bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, Members of the House ought to understand that no hearings whatever were held by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with regard to including officials and employees of the District of Columbia. For the life of me I do not understand why members of our committee were not even notified that the Committee on the District of Columbia was holding hearings on this provision which has been inserted in the bill. If we are going to be responsible for legislation brought to the House, it seems to me we should have had some testimony presented from the District government with respect to justification of these salary increases. This is a sad and sorry way in which to legislate.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would the gentleman not agree that the issue here is not a question of whether it involves a few hundred thousand dollars of additional money, but the issue is the pattern of excessive payment which is set forth and the abuse of the principle of comparability which, if we accept it in this instance, will become a pattern for other abuses of a similar type?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is exactly correct, and I support the amendment he has offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHANSEN) there were—ayes 32, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "Federal Judicial Salary Act of 1964".

SEC. 402. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, section 604(a)(5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28, United States Code, are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by title I

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(d) Section 40a of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 68(a)), as amended, relating to the compensation of full-time and part-time referees in bankruptcy, is amended by striking out the existing compensation limitations contained therein and inserting new limitations of "$22,500" and "$11,000", respectively.

SEC. 403. (a) Section 5 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, is amended by striking out "$35,500" and substituting therefor "$43,000", and by striking out "$35,000" and substituting therefor "$42,500".

(b) Section 44(d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to circuit judges, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

(c) Section 135 of title 28, United States Code, relating to district judges, is amended by striking out "$22,500" and substituting therefor "$30,000", and by striking out "$23,000" and substituting therefor "$30,500".

(d) Section 173 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Claims, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

(e) Section 213 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

(f) Section 252 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Customs Court, is amended by striking out "$22,500" and substituting therefor "$30,000".

(g) The first paragraph of section 603 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the Director and the Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, is amended to read as follows:

"The Director shall receive a salary of $28,000 a year. The Deputy Director shall receive a salary of $27,000 a year."

(h) Subsection (b) of section 792 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of commissioners of the Court of Claims, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each commissioner shall receive basic compensation at the rate of $27,000 a year, and also all necessary traveling expenses and a per diem allowance as provided in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business and away from Washington, District of Columbia."

(i) Section 7443(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (68A Stat. 879), as amended, relating to judges of the Tax Court of the United States, is further amended by striking out "$22,500" and substituting therefor "$30,000".

(j) Section 867(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Military Appeals, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of title IV be dispensed with and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chariman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: On page 78, immediately following line 2, insert the following new title:

"TITLE V—PERMANENT SYSTEM FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPER SALARY RELATIONSHIPS IN FEDERAL EXECUTIVE, JUDICIAL, CONGRESSIONAL, AND CAREER SALARIES

"SEC. 501. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that—

"(1) the salary relationships established by this Act among and between the salary rates of—

"(A) the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the Postal Field Service Schedule, in title I,

"(B) Members of Congress and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in title II,

"(C) Federal executives in title III, and

"(D) Federal judges in title IV, are consistent with the principle of comparability of Federal and private enterprise salaries contained in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, and

"(2) such salary relationships should be maintained and continued, in principle, in the future in the interest of maximum efficiency in the Government.

"(b) In accordance with the policy stated in subsection (a) of this section, whenever the Congress shall increase by law the salary rates of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the salary rate of each office or position within the purview of sections 203 and 204 of title II, sections 303 and 304 of title III, and section 403 of title IV, of this Act, shall be increased automatically, in accordance with the effective date provisions applicable to the increases so made by the Congress in the salary rates of such schedule, by a percentage equal to the greater of—

"(1) the percentage of the increase so made by the Congress in the maximum salary rate of such schedule, or

"(2) the average percentage of the increases so made by the Congress in the respective maximum salary rates of all grades of such schedule."

And on page 78, lines 3 and 4, redesignate "TITLE V" and "SEC. 501." as "TITLE VI" and "SEC. 601.", respectively.

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment falls on the last page of this bill, so I think it is apparent that we are nearing the end of the consideration of amendments. I will not attempt to pass this off as a little, old, unimportant amendment. I think it is an important amendment. I think it significantly improves the bill, and I ask that the committee adopt it. I pointed out just a little while ago that since 1866 in the administration of Andrew Johnson we have had four raises for the Members of Congress, and I suspect we have had about the same number for Cabinet members, heads of departments, and the other top people that really make this important Government run. Now, this is ridiculous. This explains why we are in this situation which we have this year. The congressional and executive and judicial salaries have been a part of this vicious cycle I wrote all of you about in this "Dear Colleague" letter yesterday. We make regular adjustments in career salaries every year of 2 years, but we wait 15 years on the average before we make any adjustment in congressional or Cabinet or top executive salaries. The result is that we get so far behind on what an adequate salary might be that we compromise. In 1955, when the last raise was put into effect, President Eisenhower's commission recommended a $30,000 salary for Cabinet members and a $27,500 salary for Members of Congress. This was compromised and compromised until we ended up with the inadequate salary which we have today.

The Randall Commission recommended last year that Cabinet salaries be $50,000; congressional salaries $35,000. And so we water down and compromise because we are so far behind that it takes a big bite to catch up, and then the cycle starts all over again. The hard fact of the matter is that the salaries we adopt in this bill will probably be in effect until 1980 if we follow the old history. I want to break this cycle. I want to set up a new system whereby we have orderly, small adjustments and keep this whole Federal pay structure in proportion.

We are establishing in this bill a structure for every single Federal employee from the top to the bottom, and if we begin to distort it in future years at the bottom and in the middle without keeping the top salaries in proportion we are going to be right back where we are today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak on the amendment. We were on title IV, and I thought I understood the gentleman to say that he had an amendment to title IV.

Mr. UDALL. This is a new title, title V, following the end of title IV, and then we renumber the following sections.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. There was no inquiry as I recall it from the Chair asking whether there were any amendments to title IV.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman would have to address his inquiry to the Chair; I cannot help him.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The reason for the parliamentary inquiry is this. Have we passed title IV or have we not?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that this is a new title. If there are further amendments to title IV, they will be in order.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his dedication, his thoroughness and the tremendous effort he has put forth on this whole salary problem. I see no reason why we should not proceed and adopt his amendment.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to commend the gentleman on what I think is a splendid amendment. I would like to recommend it, particularly to the people on this side of the aisle. I believe it will end future embarrassment and will do a great deal to prevent the distortion that the gentleman spoke of.

I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the lady from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I also would like to add my commendation to those of my colleagues of the gentleman. I think this is a splendid amendment. I think it carries out a theory that I have long championed. In fact, all the years I have been in the Congress I have urged that these things should be done on an automatic basis so that we are not caused this embarrassment, so that the salary structure should not get completely out of kilter. I think it is a splendid amendment and I certainly hope the Committee and the House will adopt it.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman how is this comparability to be determined?

Mr. UDALL. The adjustments in the executive, legislative, and judicial salaries will be made to cover the Federal salary structure in proportion. If the top of the Classification Act, let us say GS–18, is raised 3 percent, then we would raise Cabinet officers, sub-Cabinet officers and department heads and Members of Congress 3 percent. The formula is a little more complicated than that, but that is the essence of it.

Mr. MORTON. The gentleman realizes, looking at it from the other side of the street, that in industry a great many industrial salaries are determined as to comparability on Federal salaries and that under the gentleman's amendment we could get into a vicious cycle and have the salary structure escalated not on a sound economic basis but by one force being against another.

Mr. UDALL. I do not understand that there is any comparability comparison that is made between legislative, executive and judicial salaries in the Federal Establishment and salaries in private industry.

Mr. MORTON. Many private-industry salaries are determined as to their comparability by Federal salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. In response to the earlier inquiry of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the Chair will state to the gentleman if he has an amendment or if there is any other amendment to title IV of the bill, it must be presented and voted on at this time before the vote is taken on the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no amendments. I just wanted to make sure that if anyone did have an amendment, we had not gone beyond the consideration of title IV.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] a question or two. Why was this amendment not submitted in committee when the bill was considered there? This appears to be a far-reaching proposal.

Mr. UDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Well, I would respond to the gentleman's question by saying that this whole problem of freezing top salaries for the past 15 or 20 years has concerned me since we originally took up the consideration of this legislation. I tried another proposal out on the members of the committee and did not obtain a very enthusiastic response. In fact, my feelings were hurt. That proposal was the establishment of this Commission. Then it seems to me that perhaps this formula as contained in the amendment which I have offered today was the answer. I began to work it up. We had drafting difficulties and we had other technical difficulties. I did not get it ready until after consideration of this measure in the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman if it is not true that we have no testimony whatever from representatives of the Federal judiciary, from representatives of the executive branch of Government with respect to this amendment?

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I have a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dated June 8, just 2 days ago, in which he has analyzed this amendment and says that it does what I say it will do and, in effect, approves it.

Mr. GROSS. I do not doubt that it will do what you say it will do, but I would like to know more about it, and I think the Members of the House ought to know exactly what is going to happen under the terms of this amendment. I never heard of the amendment until a few moments ago. Perhaps it is inconsequential, but I would like to know what the Civil Service Commission thinks of a proposition of this kind.

The amendment goes far beyond Members of Congress. It includes the Federal judiciary and the entire executive branch of Government, as I understand it.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course.

Mr. UDALL. I have not had any official communications but I have discussed this with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and with the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget and they have both indicated to me that they think it is a fine proposal.

Mr. GROSS. This is another in a series of unusual proceedings dealing with this pay increase legislation.

I hold in my hand a copy of the hearings of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. They have held and apparently concluded hearings on this bill, H.R. 11049. How they got H.R. 11049 I do not know, because this bill is still to be passed, if it is, by the House this afternoon. It is not possible to have much stranger procedure and proceedings than those in connection with this pay increase. Apparently, the Senate having closed its hearings likewise, will not have hearings on the gentleman's amendment. It may have merit. I do not know. I will have to oppose it, not knowing its ramifications.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the full 5 minutes, but moving as fast as we are here and judging from the looks of things, I am very doubtful that we will have a rollcall vote on this bill. I am going to ask for one and hope we get it. However, I want to announce that I am opposed to the bill and I hope I get an opportunity to vote against it on a record vote. I reiterate what I said when I voted against the bill on March 12, that the legislative branch should not be included in this bill, but should be handled in separate legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in response to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] who a minute ago talked about the great amount of care and consideration which was given to this pay bill by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wonder what consideration was given to the formula that we have in operation here in the House of Representatives. At the present time we have a base pay and in order to arrive at what the actual salary is you have to go through a total of 10 steps to do that.

Under this formula which will be adopted in committee, I presume we will add another step. I do not believe there is a Member of this House who could tell me right now without referring to his chart when you put a man on the payroll at $1,000 a year the total salary he is going to get paid. This thing has grown like Topsy. I still say this committee which brought in this legislative pay bill did not have any business fooling with it at all. It should have been handled by another committee. You have not done one thing to correct the greatest problem and abuse that we have in the Congress by this bill. Therefore I am going to vote against the bill, and I hope we will have an opportunity to get a record vote.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I would like to compliment the gentleman for making the statement he did. I too hope there is a rollcall vote, but if there is not I would like the record to show I believe it would be a bad precedent for the Members of Congress to hike their salary at this time. We have talked about checking inflationary trends in our country, in my judgment we would be setting a bad example. Such action will certainly be a green light for an inflationary trend all across the board.

I join with the gentleman in the hope that a record vote will be permitted.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I just want to give the assurance that I will stand up for a RECORD vote. We ought to be on record. It is unwise to set a precedent now of increasing salaries when we need to hold down wages and prices. President Johnson made that same statement.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. MATHIAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Udall amendment and of the bill. I do not feel it is either efficient or economical for the Federal Government to be paying salary scales which are not comparable or competitive with the salary scales of private enterprise. When we have experienced personnel in the various branches of Government, legislative, judicial, and executive, it is good business to keep those qualified people. The only way to keep them is to be reasonably competitive with private enterprise. The difficulty over the years has been that the Federal Government has fallen behind business in this matter of pay. We begin to lose people as a result and then we begin to develop a pay raise which goes through a legislative process full of potholes and obstructions. These potholes and obstructions slow down the corrective action and the Government falls further behind private enterprise in comparable pay.

The Udall amendment would attempt to level out the potholes and eliminate the obstructions and will keep the Government salary scales comparable to those of private enterprise.

For that reason I am supporting both the Udall amendment and the bill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The Chairman, I am not going to offer an amendment. All I am going to ask you to do is this: You people over here undoubtedly have the votes to pass this bill, but I want to plead with you to give the Members who are opposed to this bill an opportunity to have a rollcall so that the people of this Nation will understand which Members are practicing fiscal responsibility.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. YOUNGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, for a long time we have regretted that the people held this organization in disrespect. I want to say to you in all confidence and sincerity the action that you will take today and the procedure which is going on here today will undoubtedly create in the minds of our people more disrespect for this House as a legislative body than any action that we have taken in the 12 years that I have been a Member of the House.

I regret this exceedingly. I do not care so much who votes for what, but the procedure under which this bill is being considered I object to. I do not think that anybody can defend as a legislative matter the procedure which is going on here. I do hope along with some of the rest of the Members that we do get a record vote on this bill, and that we get a record vote on increasing the limit of our national debt so that we can make comparisons of these votes at the time of the election.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Udall amendment, but I wish to take this time to set the record straight with regard to certain statistics. I have heard our minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] say many times that a Congressman is only as good as his information.

I should like to point out that the total of Federal employees' salaries today, as a percentage of our national income and gross national product, is less than it was 10 years ago. It has climbed in dollar amount to where it is now only 2.7 percent of our national income, whereas 10 years ago it was 2.8 percent. After the increase which we vote today, if we vote it, it will be back to the 1954 level of 2.8 percent. This has come about by reason of the efficiency in the Federal Government, and I say "efficiency" reservedly because I think we are trying to do too many things, but the facts are that in 1954 there was 1 Federal employee for every 66 people in the United States and now in 1964 there is 1 Federal employee for every 73 people in the United States. So if you assume that the Federal service performs today as much as it did 10 years ago for the average American, you will have to say that the Federal service is increasing efficiency by 10 percent.

There are some things about this bill I do not like—I certainly think that the postal field service shoud be given instep increases annually rather than every 2 years. I also feel that if you are going to establish the principle of comparability it should be up to date. By virtue of our delay last year when the bill was defeated, comparability is thrown back some 2 years, so it is only comparable to 1962. But it is a step in the right direction, and I think that it could stand up on the basis of comparative statistics.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is in order to state that the procedure as far as the handling of this bill is concerned certainly conforms to the general practices of the House. The chairman and Members on both sides of the aisle have been fair in the debate.

As to having a record vote, I have never had the slightest idea that there would not be a record vote. I personally intend to stand up for a record vote and to stand up for the bill.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote for this pay raise, especially as it applies to the House, Senate, and high-ranking members of the executive department. It was but a short time ago that this same bill was defeated in the House. Yet, the administration has been using every power at its disposal to force this bill through Congress despite its decisive defeat but a short time ago.

There are members of the lower paid ranks of civil service and postal workers who are entitled to a pay raise. Yet, in order to get through a great raise for other members of the Government, including Members of Congress, it has all been tied together. Why not bring the items in this legislation to Congress separately so that we can give raises where they are due to the highest paid 30 percent increases to the highest paid of our Government. This present bill allows me but one choice—to vote "no."

In a few days Congress will again be called upon to raise the already astronomical debt limit. I for one am disgusted with the story that a Congressman cannot live on $22,500 per year. The people who make this claim are also those who are the loudest to proclaim that we should do something to alleviate poverty. These high raises in salaries, including the 30 percent increase for Congress, will inflate the American dollar—that is, decrease its value—and add more to the poverty rolls. Nothing will contribute more to the extension of poverty than to cause our low-income Americans to live on a dollar of decreasing value—a dollar that purchases less and less. We must return to sanity in spending and here is a good place to begin.

I know there are many who are attempting to dodge a roll call on this bill. I for one will stand up to force a roll call so that it will be clear how everyone votes.

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 501. (a) Except to the extent provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, this Act and the increases in compensation made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Section 204 of this Act, relating to increases in compensation for Members of Congress, shall become effective at noon on January 3, 1965.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act (but except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section)—

(1) no rate of compensation which is equal to or in excess of $22,000 per annum shall be increased in any amount, by reason of this Act, until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1965; and

(2) no rate of compensation which is less than $22,000 per annum shall be increased to an amount per annum in excess of $22,000, by reason of this Act, until the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1965.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SIKES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 78, line 7, strike out lines 7 and 8 and insert the words "January 1, 1965".

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. SIKES addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because I think there is a very good reason for the distinction. At the time the last pay bill was brought up, it was urged that being Representatives when we ran for the office we knew what the salary was and this has a certain kind of validity to it. Therefore, we today if we pass this bill are fixing the salaries for whoever may be in Congress in January 1965. But so far as the other Federal employees are concerned, their equity is long overdue and I think they are entitled to immediate action.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of the amendment.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the 5 minutes. In view of the applause on the majority side, I will add, not unless an incentive is provided, Mr. Chairman. If I were disposed to waste the time of this committee, I would offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida to read that the pay raise shall become effective every January 1st hereafter. I say this because of the statement made by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] in his letter to the Members. He said "the Congress has already established the machinery"—and get these words so you know what you are doing—'for regular annual adjustments." Now we provide regular annual adjustments for Members of the Congress, for the judiciary and for Heaven knows how many top officials of the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: Page 8, after line 24, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 502. The increases in compensation made by this Act shall not be effective until such time as the receipts of the Government for the preceding fiscal year have exceeded the expenditures of the Government for such year, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget."

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, we all talk about balanced budgets. We all talk about fiscal responsibility. We all talk about holding the line on spending. And we all know that this bill is inflationary to the very core. We know it will be financed with borrowed money, not with money from the Treasury. We know full well that in a few days the Federal debt ceiling will go to $324 billion. We all know a balanced budget is nowhere in sight for the next fiscal year or for the year following. If we are unwilling to exercise a little fiscal restraint in regard to our own paychecks, can we hope that a balanced budget will occur in the foreseeable future?

My amendment, if adopted, would make "budget cutters" out of everyone on the Federal payroll, including Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, and all other civilians on the Federal payroll. If my amendment is adopted, each would have a personal stake in cutting waste and balancing the budget. It is the one sure way to get a balanced budget fast, and a pay raise, too.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I believe it might be well, Mr. Chairman, to remind the Members of this House that if this increase which is contemplated to be provided by the bill goes into effect and is made law, it will then cost each American family, on an average, to pay just for Federal employees, a little less than $30 a month. That is not $30 a year. The cost to each American family, on an average, just to be governed from Washington, D.C., will be about $350 a year.

I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I can vote for the bill if his amendment is approved. I shall vote against the bill if his amendment is not approved by this House.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. As I understand the amendment, it proposes that unless we have a balanced budget Members of Congress could not have a salary increase.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is not quite accurate. It would delay any and all increases in compensation provided in this bill until such date as the Federal Government had finished one fiscal year with a balanced budget.

Mr. DENT. Then, the gentleman would suggest that if General Motors did not have a profitable year, the employees should not have their compensation regardless of the fact that they had a contract for their compensation?

Mr. FINDLEY. General Motors is not provided for in this bill, I assure the gentleman.

I might add that if the General Motors Corp. had had a record of red ink as long as the Federal Government's, it would have been out of business long ago.

Mr. DENT. That may be true.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

[Mr. DENT addressed the Committee. His remarks appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to impose unduly on the time of the House, but since General Motors has been mentioned I think it might be well to compare congressional pay with salaries of officials of General Motors, the Nation's largest defense contractor—59 executives of General Motors receive more in salaries than the salaries of the combined membership of this House of Representatives; add to that 100 Members of the U.S. Senate; add to that all members of the President's Cabinet, members of the U.S. Supreme Court, salaries of the Vice President and the President, and then add to all of those the Governors of the 50 States. And all together they add up to less than the salaries of 59 executives of General Motors. And the taxpayers in the long run pay those salaries, too.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative RHODES, to require income disclosure by Members as a precondition of their receiving a pay increase.

At the outset, I wish to state that I believe a pay increase for Members is justified from whatever angle the matter is judged—responsibility, hours, volume of work, competence, and conscientiousness. I do believe, however, that if the salary is to be increased to $30,000 a year, then there is a responsibility by Members to rely exclusively upon their congressional salary and to consider it as a fulltime job. Many, many Members as of today, work 70 and 80 hours a week. But it does seem to me the public is entitled to know the amount and sources of earned outside income of their legislators.

By earned outside income I mean compensation for services, including fees and commissions, gross income derived from business, gains derived from dealings in property and distributive share of partnership gross income—income from work which a Member is doing while he also is serving in Congress.

Attention has been drawn in recent months to the investigation into activities of Robert Baker when he was Secretary to the majority in the Senate. Many Members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, are, as a result, supporting legislation to require, among other things, disclosure of outside income sources by legislative employees. Some Members would extend this requirement to Senators themselves. We certainly can do no less.

Mr. Chairman, mandatory disclosure would, in my view, work to the advantage of the Congress. It would dispel the innuendoes and inferences about the financial connections of Members. It would help discredit the all-inclusive accusations and the general condemnation. Some argue that disclosure would make second-class citizens of Members of the House and Senate. I do not believe it would. We require public disclosure by members of the executive branch who must be confirmed.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

In recent times, many Members of both Senate and House have individually filed their annual statements of income, stocks, and real property holdings. In April 1963, for example, several Members of the House together filed their individual statements. Since then, other House Members have done the same. I would hope that an even larger number of Members would voluntarily file such statements.

It is time that Democrats and Republicans alike should take whatever steps are necessary to maintain the integrity of the National Legislature lest an erosion of public confidence become a real threat to the democratic process.

The job for each and every one of us is to so conduct the Nation's business that the confidence of the country in the National Legislature is maintained—yes, and strengthened. As I said, we demand this of high-ranking members of the executive branch of the Federal Government—the Secretary of Defense, for example. But we do not hold ourselves to the same strict standards of accountability.

A disclosure requirement would immeasurably assist in enhancing the reputation of the Congress.

Again, I say that the Members of Congress do deserve an increase, and, of course, especially do the postal employees and many of the judicial and executive branches. I think that a disclosure provision for Members of Congress is a just and acceptable obligation that the American people have a right to expect, indeed demand.

Therefore, I am happy to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman RHODES, in support of this very important amendment.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES], fully realizing that the majority of the House are not ready to adopt a rule binding on all Members concerning disclosure of outside interests. But, while I have few illusions about the present degree of support for full and open disclosure, I share the gentleman from Pennsylvania's view that making outside sources of income a matter of public knowledge would go far toward checking the growing distrust and indifference with which the American people regard their Congress.

The distinguished minority leader in the other body has said on several occasions that he would resist a disclosure rule because it would make him a "second-class citizen." I disagree. I think his support for such a rule could only increase the high regard in which he is held, and I cannot believe that his own self-esteem is so fragile that filing a financial statement by April 15 of each year would bend or break it.

Certainly disclosure requirements have not been demoralizing in any noticeable way to the thousands of corporation and bank executives who must reveal their compensation and personal holdings, state changes in these holdings, or make public their membership on certain boards of directors. And certainly Congress itself thought it was striking a blow for better Government by better people when it imposed conflicts of interests rules on top administration officials.

If Congress continues to exempt itself from the sort of disclosure prescriptions it has freely issued to agencies like the SEC, the CAB, and the ICC, it can expect it to be distrusted, just like anyone is who has the power to make himself a special case and uses it for that purpose.

During the past few years a growing number of Members in each body have voluntarily disclosed their holdings and outside sources of income. As one such Member I must say that I wonder about the effect this has. I am inclined to think that one unintended result is to reinforce the view that those who do not make a public disclosure are necessarily hiding something, when in fact there is probably not that much to hide.

But the American people, like nature, abhor a vacuum. Where there is a sustained and inexplicable lack of knowledge about a matter of public trust such as the financial activities of elected Representatives, suspicions mount until they tower above reality and the least shred of evidence is taken as confirming them all. The only way to reduce this evidence to its proper significance is to confront these suspicions with the hard facts through complete annual disclosure of holdings and sources of income.

Failure to treat disclosure as a real issue which Congress must raise and solve for itself can only result in the silent erosion of respect for this institution and representative government everywhere. Should Congress fail to enjoy the genuine respect of those who look to it for leadership, it can hardly blame the people, the times, or the unseen enemy for the fact that leadership is sought and found elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINDLEY) there were—ayes 60, noes 162.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11049) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes pursuant to House Resolution 733, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman o posed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentlema qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion t recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill, H.I 11049, to the Committee on Post Office an Civil Service.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is o the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is o the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 243, nays 157, answered "present" 4, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—243

Addabbo	Frelinghuysen	Macdonald
Albert	Friedel	Madden
Anderson	Fulton, Pa.	Mailliard
Ashley	Gallagher	Martin, Mass.
Aspinall	Garmatz	Mathias
Auchincloss	Gary	Matsunaga
Barrett	Giaimo	Michel
Barry	Gibbons	Miller, Calif.
Bates	Gilbert	Milliken
Becker	Gill	Minish
Beckworth	Glenn	Monagan
Bell	Gonzalez	Moore
Bennett, Mich.	Grabowski	Moorhead
Blatnik	Gray	Morgan
Boggs	Green, Oreg.	Morrison
Boland	Green, Pa.	Morse
Bolling	Griffiths	Moss
Bonner	Grover	Multer
Bow	Gubser	Murphy, Ill.
Brademas	Hagan, Ga.	Murphy, N.Y.
Brooks	Hagen, Calif.	Murray
Brown, Calif.	Halpern	Nedzi
Broyhill, Va.	Hanna	Nix
Buckley	Hansen	O'Brien, N.Y.
Burke	Harding	O'Hara, Ill.
Burkhalter	Hardy	O'Hara, Mich.
Burton, Calif.	Harris	Olsen, Mont.
Burton, Utah	Harrison	O'Neill
Byrne, Pa.	Hawkins	Osmers
Cahill	Hays	Ostertag
Cameron	Healey	Passman
Carey	Hébert	Patman
Casey	Henderson	Patten
Celler	Hoffman	Pelly
Cohelan	Holifield	Pepper
Conte	Holland	Philbin
Cooley	Horton	Pike
Corbett	Hosmer	Pilcher
Corman	Jennings	Pool
Daddario	Joelson	Price
Daniels	Johnson, Calif.	Pucinski
Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Wis.	Purcell
Davis, Tenn.	Karsten	Rains
Dawson	Karth	Reid, N.Y.
Delaney	Kastenmeier	Reuss
Dent	Kee	Rhodes, Pa.
Denton	Keith	Rivers, Alaska
Derounian	Kelly	Rivers, S.C.
Diggs	Kilgore	Rodino
Dingell	King, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Donohue	King, N.Y.	Rooney, N.Y.
Downing	Kirwan	Rooney, Pa.
Duiski	Kluczynski	Roosevelt
Duncan	Kornegay	Rosenthal
Dwyer	Kunkel	Rostenkowski
Edwards	Lankford	Roybal
Elliott	Leggett	Ryan, Mich.
Ellsworth	Lesinski	Ryan, N.Y.
Fallon	Libonati	St Germain
Farbstein	Lindsay	St. Onge
Fascell	Long, Md.	Schwengel
Finnegan	McCulloch	Scott
Fino	McDade	Senner
Flood	McDowell	Sibal
Flynt	McFall	Sickles
Fogarty	McLoskey	Sikes
Fraser	McMillan	Sisk

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Slack	Thompson, Tex.	Weltner
Smith, Calif.	Tollefson	Westland
Smith, Iowa	Trimble	White
Staebler	Tupper	Wickersham
Stafford	Tuten	Widnall
Staggers	Udall	Willis
Steed	Ullman	Wilson,
Stephens	Van Deerlin	Charles H.
Stratton	Vanik	Wright
Sullivan	Van Pelt	Wydler
Talcott	Vinson	Wyman
Taylor	Waggonner	Young
Teague, Calif.	Wallhauser	Zablocki
Thomas	Watson	
Thompson, N.J.	Watts	

NAYS—157

Abbitt	Fisher	Nelsen
Abele	Ford	Norblad
Abernethy	Foreman	O'Konski
Adair	Fountain	Olson, Minn.
Alger	Fuqua	Perkins
Andrews, Ala.	Gathings	Pillion
Andrews,	Goodell	Pirnie
N. Dak.	Goodling	Poage
Arends	Grant	Poff
Ashbrook	Griffin	Quie
Avery	Gross	Quillen
Ayres	Gurney	Reid, Ill.
Baker	Haley	Reifel
Baldwin	Halleck	Rhodes, Ariz.
Baring	Harsha	Rich
Beermann	Harvey, Ind.	Richlman
Belcher	Harvey, Mich.	Roberts, Tex.
Bennett, Fla.	Hechler	Robison
Berry	Hoeven	Rogers, Fla.
Betts	Horan	Rogers, Tex.
Bolton,	Huddleston	Roudebush
Frances P.	Hull	Rumsfeld
Bray	Hutchinson	St. George
Brock	Ichord	Saylor
Bromwell	Jarman	Schadeberg
Broomfield	Jensen	Schenck
Brotzman	Johansen	Schneebeli
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Pa.	Schweiker
Broyhill, N.C.	Jonas	Secrest
Bruce	Jones, Mo.	Selden
Burleson	Kilburn	Short
Byrnes, Wis.	Knox	Shriver
Cederberg	Kyl	Siler
Chamberlain	Laird	Skubitz
Chelf	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Chenoweth	Langen	Snyder
Clancy	Latta	Springer
Clawson, Del	Lennon	Stinson
Cleveland	Lipscomb	Stubblefield
Collier	McClory	Taft
Colmer	MacGregor	Thomson, Wis.
Cramer	Mahon	Tuck
Cunningham	Marsh	Utt
Curtin	Martin, Calif.	Weaver
Curtis	Martin, Nebr.	Whalley
Dague	Matthews	Wharton
Derwinski	Meader	Whitener
Devine	Minshall	Whitten
Dole	Montoya	Williams
Dorn	Morris	Wilson, Bob
Everett	Morton	Wilson, Ind.
Feighan	Mosher	Winstead
Findley	Natcher	Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Edmondson	Pickle	Randall
Mills		

NOT VOTING—27

Ashmore	Forrester	Miller, N.Y.
Bass	Fulton, Tenn.	Powell
Battin	Hall	Roberts, Ala.
Bolton,	Herlong	Roush
Oliver P.	Jones, Ala.	Sheppard
Clark	Keogh	Shipley
Clausen,	Lloyd	Teague, Tex.
Don H.	Long, La.	Thompson, La.
Dowdy	McIntire	Toll
Evins	May	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Randall against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Mills against.

Mr. Roush for, with Mr. Edmondson against.

Mr. Bass for, with Mr. Pickle against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Jones of Alabama against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Teague of Texas against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Hall against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mrs. May against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Don H. Clausen against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Forrester.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS]. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG]. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH]. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks prior to the vote on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JUNE 15

(Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of this week and the program for next week, if he can tell us at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, the program for the House of Representatives for the week of June 15 is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day. There are 5 suspensions:

H.R. 4994, labeling of imported woven labels.

Senate Joint Resolution 103, authorization increase for President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

House Joint Resolution 1041, interim 90-day extension of rental housing insurance program for the elderly.

H.R. 10000, extension of the Defense Production Act.

H.R. 11499, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called. Also on Tuesday the 1965 appropriations for public works and H.R. 9876, extension and amendment of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. This has an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

On Wednesday H.R. 11376, the Excise-Tax Rate Extension Act of 1964. This has a close rule with 4 hours of debate, waiving points of order.

Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 11375, the public debt limit. This has a closed rule with 4 hours of debate, waiving points of order.

This announcement, of course, is made with the general reservation that any further program may be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, in regard to H.R. 10000, I think it might be well for us to explain to the membership, in view of the fact that there were minority views filed, that that measure will be offered under suspension with an amendment which, as I understand it, removes the objections of the people who signed the minority views.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's understanding coincides with mine.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JUNE 15

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CLARENCE CANNON: MEMORIAL TRIBUTE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, among the many fine tributes to the late and greatly beloved Clarence Cannon, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, is that of his long-time friend and former colleague here, Maurice H. Thatcher, who served for 5 terms—1923-33—as Representative from the Louisville, Ky., district.

The two were elected to the 68th Congress, and began their service in the House at the start of that session on March 4, 1923. Mr. Thatcher was a member of the House Committee on Appropriations throughout his congressional career of 10 years. Mr. Cannon served in Congress, as a Representative from the Mark Twain region of Missouri, from the beginning of the 68th Congress until his death, which occurred on May 12, 1964, after an uninterrupted service of more than 40 years, and in 21 Congresses. He became a member of the indicated committee in 1929, and its chairman in 1941. He continued as such chairman until his death excepting the 80th and 83d Congresses, when the opposing party was in control. Thus he established a record for this chairmanship of something like 19 years, and almost twice that of any other chairman; and this, in itself, constitutes a splendid evidence of his integrity and ability, and the esteem of his colleagues.

The budgetary system of fiscal affairs was instituted during the chairmanship of the committee of Congressman Martin B. Madden, of Illinois, who like Cannon, was an outstanding head of the committee, and to whose integrity and ability Mr. Cannon always gave generous praise. Both were dedicated servants of the people; both were thoroughly informed with respect to the needs involved; and both, while wise and just in their attitudes, were also the abiding friend of the American taxpayer, and always sought to protect his legitimate interests. With all truth it may be said that Madden and Cannon were two of the greatest chairmen of this highly important committee in all its long history.

Mr. Cannon and Mr. Thatcher were good friends from the beginning of their congressional careers; and their friendship, through the long period which has since elapsed, grew stronger and ever stronger. Both had—among other common interests—a love and appreciation for the best in literature; and, touching Mr. Thatcher's occasional writings, his friend was lavish in his praise.

It may be noted that Mr. Thatcher had served, during the construction era of the Panama Canal, as Civil Governor of the Canal Zone and member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, the body which had immediate charge of the work. In these posts he had rendered distinguished service; and later came his congressional career. He sponsored and brought about the enactment of much important legislation for the benefit of the canal enterprise, and its employees—both United States and alien citizens; also for the advantage of the entire isthmus, including legislation for the establishment and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in the city of Panama, an outstanding institution for research touching the cause and prevention of tropical disease. He is now the sole surviving member of the indicated Commission. He also rendered important service in the Congress in the field of national parks and parkways; and is yet interested in these subjects, and able to give civilian aid in these connections.

Because of his capable and useful congressional service, his membership on the House Committee on Appropriations, and his fine achievements with respect to the canal and the isthmus, the Congress, by specific enactment, and with complete unanimity, named for him the splendid new bridge across the canal at Balboa, Canal Zone, as Thatcher Ferry Bridge, which not only honors him, but as well serves to perpetuate historic memory and justice to the Thatcher Ferry, on the same site, which the bridge supplants. In the Congress he had obtained the legislation for the establishment and maintenance of the ferry, a fine, toll-free utility—as is the bridge—which, during the 30 years of its existence, performed for the zone and the entire isthmus a notable and indispensable service.

Mr. Thatcher has practiced law in Washington since he left Congress, and has also continued his activities, to the extent possible, in behalf of matters of public concern. Under leave accorded, I include, as a part of these remarks, his magnificent tribute to his greatly esteemed and beloved friend.

CLARENCE CANNON: MEMORIAL TRIBUTE

(By Maurice H. Thatcher)

I

When this, our Clarence, passed away
From mortal life to deathless day—
Alas, the loss! the people wept;
The trust they gave him he had kept;
And they, in grief, kneeled down to pray.

How great was he? Ah, time will say!
His toils for good no check could stay;
And his brave conscience never slept—
He loved the State.

Truth's path he trod—led where it may;
His zeal for light nought would allay.
He never was unskilled, inept;
Less than the best he'd not accept;
He wrought in strength, with knowledged play—
To serve the State.

II

His life was like a battle song:
He read the score with practiced eye;
His image should survive as long
As Freedom's banner greets the sky.
With human warmth he loved his friends,
And they loved him—a mutual bond.
A name like his fades not, nor ends,
But lives tomorrow and beyond.

Teacher, lawyer, statesman, chief—
Thru calm and storm, and cloud and shade;
And, minus pause or aught relief,
His rugged, sure ascent was made.
Exemplar rare, and patriot,
His life a pattern doth provide
For those who seek the nobler lot—
A norm the nation's youth to guide.

Steeped in the parliamentary lore,
And knowledge of resolves and bills,
He won a rank as few before,
Or since; and his especial skills
Earned rich reward and potent yield
In guarding well the Nation's purse.
Thus, long he strove within his field
To find the cure, and void the curse.

By reason of his varied acts
We must account his labors great;
He knew the fictions and the facts
And how the problems to equate
Friend of his fellows, loyal, true—
He fought for that he thought was best.
We pay him laud for what is due
For efforts that were wise and blest.

He strove with ever-tireless aim;
His life was one of self-denial;
His wisdom brought him wealths of fame—
But at the price of rack and trial.
He dared to do what seemed the right,
And knew the worth of valiant deeds;
He chose to walk within the light,
And from the flowers plucked the weeds.

Full-rev'rent in his biding thought,
And e'er sustained by faith and hope—
The vital goals he sensed and sought,
And wide-expanding was the scope.
He knew the need for discipline;
The face of virtue was his chart.
His home he loved, and all therein,
With all his ardent soul and heart.

How well it was that to the last
The purpose of his will obtained,
And that he gave, with knowledge vast,
The needed aid, while strength remained.
In harness thus, he passed away—
A knightly fate which few may know,
But one for which all heroes pray:
This was the way he wished to go.

How weak the word for any man
Of such supreme, unique degree.
He was a great American,
As all the rounded world could see.
Throughout the span of lengthened years,
He served the people and the State:
Go, search the Temple—there appears
His name, in gold, upon the Gate.

* * * * *

Accept this, Clarence, from a friend
Who knew thee long, and knew thee well—
A former colleague, who would amend
Death's dark decree its force dispel,
If in his power. The loved helpmate,
And those that bear thy blood, shall be
Shrined in the love of friends who wait
At portals of eternity.

LETTER TO CHRISTIAN HERTER

(Mr. HARVEY of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following letter which I mailed today to Hon. Christian Herter, our Special Representative for Trade Negotiations in Geneva.

JUNE 11, 1964.

HON. CHRISTIAN HERTER,
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HERTER: The domestic ball and roller bearing and steel ball and roller bearing industries are in considerable difficulties today, Mr. Herter, because of the imports of these items from Japan and other countries. Perhaps you have seen the several extensions of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which pinpoint this problem from a national scale. I would like to call your attention to what the bearing industry means to just one congressional district—my own.

The Federal-Mogul-Bower Bearing Co., in Greensburg, Ind., has over 200 full-time employees, so roughly 1,000 family members in the Greensburg area are dependent upon the success of this company. The company has an annual payroll of over $1 million in the Greensburg area alone, and most of this money is spent right at home with retailers, service and professional people. The loss of this payroll would have a most detrimental

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

gotiations. It is an ideal concession, and one within the present authority of the administration to make. We would make one further point. A recent comprehensive review of residual fuel oil imports by the OEP had the universal concurrence of all participating departments that controls of this product contributed little, if anything, to the national security. There would therefore appear to be good grounds for their complete removal in the national interest and if so, what better time than during the GATT negotiations when we might get something in return.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing statement by Myron A. Wright was recently mailed to Congressmen and Governors by John K. Evans, executive director of the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc. Mr. Evans' covering letter speaks eloquently of the unfairness of continuing residual oil quotas. Because of its general interest, I am including here in the RECORD Mr. Evans' letter at that time:

INDEPENDENT FUEL OIL MARKETERS OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1964.

DEAR SIR: As a public official from a highly industrialized and populated State, you have a stake in the subject, namely, residual fuel oil import restrictions and controls. Any action by our Government, created and caused for purely political reasons, that has a negative impact on the consumer of energy in your State is an issue that is of considerable significance and importance to you. The restrictions that were placed on the importation of residual fuel oil in 1959 were the result of an all-out propaganda campaign by the coal mine owners of our country and are costing the consumers in your State millions of dollars each year because the electric utilities are being denied their traditional right of freedom of choice of not only supplier but also of competitive forms of energy. In addition, the large industrial consumers of this fuel, such as large manufacturing plants, pulp and paper mills, etc., also are being forced to pay higher prices for their fuels. As a result, industrial enterprises are placed at a disadvantage competitively, not only within the boundaries of our country but also when it comes to competing with foreign products in world markets. Representatives of these groups are all on record confirming the above since they have filed statements with the Trade Information Committee on the subject matter. This organization represents the "small businessman" engaged in marketing residual fuel oil on the east coast and we have been fighting for a return to the free enterprise system since 1960.

My main purpose in writing you this letter is to forward the enclosed statement that was filed by the executive vice president of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) with the trade information committee under date of March 31, 1964. This is one of the finest, most concise, most dispassionate and most factual statement that has ever been made on this overall subject. We suggest that you read the statement and that you pass it along to any member on your staff who has anything to do with trade issues and the welfare and competitive standing of the industrial economy of your State. Just to put the record straight, this organization has no ax to grind with Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey). In fact we have continually criticized the Secretary of the Interior for the regulations that control these imports because they concentrate over 50 percent of the total allocation in the hands of four major imports and the largest of this group is Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey). The latter makes it all the more impressive and it is a credit to Mr. Wright's company that they subordinate their own corporate selfish interests to the welfare of our country. It is too bad that the coal mine owners of America do not have some of this patriotism and loyalty. It is self-evident from this statement that Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) not only believes in the socially conscious American private enterprise system, but is willing to fight for that system and to subordinate its own corporate interests in the process.

It's time for the consumer to stand up and fight for his rights. The "squeaking wheel gets the most grease" in Washington and the only way in which the best interests of our country and your State can be served is for you, the representative of the consumers, to stand up and protest not only to the President but also to Secretary Udall to the end that the best interests of our Nation are served.

I am sending a copy of this letter to all of the chambers of commerce in your State and to other civic organizations.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN K. EVANS.

ANNIVERSARY OF ADOPTION OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

(Mr. WALLHAUSER (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join my distinguished colleagues in the House, to pay tribute to the great nation of Poland on the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, May 3, 1791.

For many years the U.S. Congress has commemorated this date in the chronicals of Polish history. We recall this anniversary for the many Americans who are deservedly proud of their Polish heritage and wish to remember the day on which their homeland, after many, many years of struggle and barely 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution in 1789, succeeded in asserting the principles of democracy. But more importantly, we, who are privileged to serve in the U.S. Congress, are memorializing the date of May 3, 1791, in order to give hope and encouragement to the people of Poland who despite their present oppression by the Soviet Union fervently hope to once again live in a free and democratic nation.

The May 3 Constitution stated:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people.

These words sound strikingly familar to all Americans whose freedom has been secured through the ages by the words of our Declaration of Independence—

Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

We in this country have been more fortunate in preserving the foundations of democratic government so firmly established by our Founding Fathers. The Poles were less fortunate in attaining a lasting foundation for the third partition of Poland by Russia, Prussia, and Austria came only 4 years later, 1795.

Today the free world considers Poland a Communist country. Yet, we should and do recognize that though the Polish Government is "Communist" the Polish people are not.

May 3 cannot be a joyous holiday similar to the exuberant celebration of our July the Fourth anniversary, but it is a date for reflection and prayer. And it is fitting that we in this great Nation, who are so richly blessed with the privileges of liberty granted by our Constitution, should today pay tribute to the Polish people who are struggling to regain their freedom and join in their prayers that they may once again realize the rights of life, liferty, and the pursuit of happiness.

PAY RAISE—A THREAT TO WAGE AND PRICE STABILITY

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, Under Secretary of the Treasury Robert V. Roosa, warned that the United States could face a balance-of-payments "tragedy" unless wage and price stability is maintained this year. His statement was reported in the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, April 30, 1964, in connection with a new offering of 10-year Treasury bonds bearing a 4½-percent coupon rate, the highest the Treasury can legally bear, to refund $10.6 billion of bonds maturing this month.

On the same day, the Washington Evening Star carried a full-page headline "New Pay Raise Gains in the House." The story went on to point out that the House Civil Service Committee by a vote of 14 to 3 had endorsed a new pay raise bill but one which is substantially similar to that which the House voted against last month.

When we passed the tax-cut bill, in spite of the fact that it would mean a deficit, solemn promises were made that budgetary restraint would be exercised. Although a case can be made for pay increases, how can administration leaders call for wage and price stability at the very time they are pushing pay increases for Federal employees and Congressmen through this House? There is an inconsistency in their positions that is troublesome. People have a right to expect their elected representatives to set good examples. If important spokesmen for the administration call on business and labor and the private sector of the economy to exercise restraint and maintain wage and price stability, certainly the people of this country should expect the U.S. House of Representatives to practice what the administration is preaching.

TAX TREATMENT OF BEER CONCENTRATE

(Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill (H.R. 11111) to amend the Internal Rev-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

enue Code of 1954 relating to the manufacture, use, and sale of beer concentrate.

The bill is intended to preserve the "status quo" until such time as there is a more definitive understanding and evaluation of the use and economic effect of beer concentrate. The bill distinguishes between "beer" and "beer concentrate" in order that the latter cannot be shipped in interstate commerce as beer. The bill may be summarized as follows:

First. The bill defines "beer concentrate" as a product separate and distinct from "beer."

Second. The bill provides for the manufacture of "beer concentrate" in the brewery for inplant use.

Third. The bill provides for the exportation of "beer concentrate" free of tax.

Fourth. Finally, the bill prohibits the shipment of "beer concentrate" to bottling plants or other breweries for reconstitution into beer.

While the concentration process has been used for several years with respect to products such as fruit juices, it was only recently applied to beer on a "test basis." Under the concentrate process, the beer is brewed in the brewery in the same manner as always. A part of the brewing water is subsequently removed, by freezing or some other process, reducing the beer to a concentrated sirup of about one-fourth its original volume. This sirup may then be reconstituted into beer either at the same brewery, or at another location such as a bottling plant. At the bottling plant, carbon dioxide and water are added to the beer concentrate to restore the mixture to the original consistency of beer. The beer is then bottled and marketed in the usual manner.

Chapter 51 of the Internal Revenue Code regulates the manufacture, taxation, and sale of all alcoholic beverages. Under the code and prior regulations, "beer" could only be produced in a brewery. A tax of $9 per barrel is levied upon the beer when removed for consumption or sale. Beer could be transported under bond between related breweries—under common control ownership—without the payment of tax. Beer could also be removed from a brewery for analysis and for export. However, there was no provision in the Internal Revenue Code or the regulations governing the manufacture, transportation, taxation, or a sale of beer concentrate.

The Treasury Department published proposed regulations for the utilization of beer concentrate in the Federal Register on August 31, 1963. These regulations authorize the manufacture in a brewery of beer concentrate and its shipment under bond to another brewery—or bottling plant—owned by the same brewer without payment of the Federal tax. The beer concentrate could then be reconstituted at the bottling plant and the tax paid there. These regulations went into effect on December 1, 1963.

Because of widespread concern over the proposed regulations, hearings were held by the Committee on Ways and Means on November 5 of last year.

While the regulations have not attempted to levy a tax directly on beer concentrate, the regulations have broadened the code section dealing with in-bond shipment of beer. The tax provided for in the code is a tax on beer, and on beer alone. This tax is based on volume—$9 per barrel. If beer concentrate is construed to be "beer," there would be a tremendous loss of tax revenue through the reduction in volume of the taxable article. If beer concentrate is not a "beer," there is no statutory authority to permit its shipment under bond as between related breweries. Thus we have an anomalous situation where by regulations beer concentrate is treated as "beer" for shipment under bond, but cannot be classified as "beer" for tax purposes. In my opinion, these regulations are of doubtful validity, and certainly fail to offer any satisfactory solution to the problem.

At the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee it became apparent that there was justifiable concern over the impact of beer concentrate upon the industry, and particularly if the indiscriminate shipment of such beer concentrate should be permitted as between breweries or bottling plants under common ownership. It was pointed out that a central brewery might merely set up bottling plants around the country which would qualify as breweries for tax purposes. Shipments of beer concentrate could be made to such bottling plants to the detriment of the full-fledged brewery which had been established to serve that locality.

Concern was also expressed over the possibility of damage to the beer industry through lack of sufficient control over the quality of beer produced by reconstituting beer concentrate. Some witnesses, however, claimed that the reconstituting process improved the quality of the beer.

The licensing of the shipment of beer concentrate under these regulations thus could present a serious economic threat to the many local breweries and their employees. Large centralized breweries could establish reconstituting and bottling plants in areas already adequately served by local breweries. At a relatively small investment, a bottling plant could be set up to flood an area with reconstituted beer and thereby destroy the jobs and investment in the local brewery. On the other hand, the local brewery could in no way profit from the regulations for the use of beer concentrate. The local brewery could not buy the concentrate from a central brewery since, under the regulations, it can only be shipped under bond to a bottling plant owned by the manufacturer of the concentrate.

The small breweries of the country are already having difficulty meeting the competition of the larger breweries with their national advertising campaigns. The number of small breweries continues to decrease. I am advised that in 1934, there were 725 breweries operating in the United States. Ten years later, this number had declined to 463. During the next 10 years—by 1954—the number declined to 298 breweries. Today, there are only about 195 breweries, 16 of which are multiple-plant operators. Prompt action will be necessary if we are to preserve the remaining independent breweries.

The bill has the support of the U.S. Brewers' Association and the Brewers' Association of America. These organizations represent practically all the breweries in the United States.

The bill I have introduced would limit the utilization of beer concentrate to the brewery in which the concentrate is first produced, thereby preserving the situation which existed prior to the promulgation of these regulations. I propose this—not as a permanent solution to the problem—but to forestall any irreparable injury to the small independent brewers until a better solution can be considered by Congress.

At present there is no need to provide for the shipment of beer concentrate. The process is still in the experimental stage. Therefore, we are not acting to stop a present practice in the industry. If we delay taking action, however, and the larger breweries begin shipping concentrate, and possibly establishing bottling facilities, it might be too late to do anything to save the small brewer.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on April 30 I introduced legislation to extend the period in which unemployment compensation benefits are paid to jobless workers to 39 weeks, provide for unemployment insurance grants to the States, and otherwise strengthen the unemployment compensation program.

In December of last year, the shutdown of production by the Studebaker Corp. cost the jobs of more than 6,000 workers in South Bend, Ind. Yet, as President Johnson remarked this past weekend, after his visit to South Bend, the people of South Bend have "rolled up their sleeves and stuck out their chins and gone ahead."

Already, the Kaiser Jeep Corp., Allied Industries, and the Cummins Co. have taken over parts of the Studebaker facilities, and are well on their way to providing several hundred new jobs. We are retraining hundreds of others in skills which will give them the opportunity to participate in the benefits of prosperity.

But at the same time, 350 South Bend workers have already exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits. Many more are faced with the prospect of losing their rights to compensation in the next few months.

In the State of Indiana, the maximum period of compensation is 26 weeks, and less than a third of the workers are covered for even that length of time. The maximum benefit in Indiana, I might add, is $36 per week. Again, a substantial number of the unemployed—30 per-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

results of each of its studies and investigations, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

PAY INCREASE BILL

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon there was delivered to the offices of the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee a new pay increase bill for Members of Congress and others. This morning, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee convened, the gavel fell at 10:35, and a motion was promptly made to limit consideration and vote the bill out at 11:20. No hearings were held on the new bill. There have been no hearings on any of the pay increase bills since last October 15. Not a single witness from the administration was permitted to appear in behalf of the new bill that, I say, was made available in the offices of committee members only yesterday afternoon. The new bill, calling for pay increases of more than half a billion dollars a year, was voted out at 11:20 this morning after only 45 minutes of consideration. It was one of the most high-handed operations I have witnessed in my 16 years in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there were a few of us on the committee who yelped like beagle hounds, and we did not have to have any pulling of the ears by Lyndon Johnson, either.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permision to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, May 3 will be the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. This momentous event occurred in 1791.

Today I want to join with all the other friends of the Polish people to demonstrate to them that we do care about the valiant defense of freedom they have maintained through the years.

The nation of Poland has a heritage of Christianity and participation in the growth of Western culture. It is one of the black spots of history that this noble nation and its courageous people are being ruthlessly suppressed by the Communist system.

The tremendous struggle of the Poles in World War II against Nazi-Communist totalitarianism is an inspiration to all humanity.

We all hope and pray that this country may one day rejoin the community of free nations.

AUTHORIZING NEVADA TO DIVIDE ITS RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill—H.R. 287—to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Nevada among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 218(d)(6)(C) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "Nevada," after "New Mexico,".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "after" and insert "before".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include the State of Nevada under the provision of present law permitting specified States to divide State or local government retirement systems for social security coverage purposes. Under this provision, 17 specified States—and all interstate instrumentalities—are permitted to divide a State or local government retirement system into two parts for purposes of old-age, survivors', and disability insurance coverage, one part consisting of the positions of members who desire coverage, and the other consisting of the positions of members who do not desire coverage. Services performed by the members in the part consisting of the positions of members who desire coverage may then be covered under old-age, survivors', and disability insurance, and, once those services are covered, the services of all persons who in the future become members of the retirement system must also be covered.

H.R. 287, which was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable WALTER S. BARING, would include the State of Nevada in this list of States. The Committee on Ways and Means unanimously recommends its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 287 amends title II of the Social Security Act to include the State of Nevada under the provision of present law which permits States specified in the law to divide their State or local government retirement system into two parts and provide social security coverage for those current employees who desire such coverage.

As a representative from Wisconsin, the State which has been a leader in the establishment of public retirement systems, I rise in support of this legislation. I need not remind my colleagues that the Wisconsin system was founded prior to the Federal social security system and and was the first State to integrate its retirement system with the Federal system. This legislation merely adds the State of Nevada to the list of 17 other States, including Wisconsin, which may divide their retirement system to provide OASDI coverage for those employees desiring such coverage.

The bill was unanimously reported from the Ways and Means Committee and is worthy of your support.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

[Mr. BARING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] and I may extend our remarks in explanation of these bills reported from the Committee on Ways and Means and which are passed by the House today, and in addition that the authors of the bills and any other Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks immediately following the passage of the particular bills involved.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RETIREMENT SYSTEMS IN MAINE: POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN IN TEXAS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 3348) to amend section 316 of the Social Security Amendments of 1958 to extend the time within which teachers and other employees covered by the same retirement system in the State of Maine may be treated as being covered by separate retirement systems for purposes of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I shall not object, is the gentleman going to explain the bills?

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to give an explanation of any of the bills I am asked to explain.

Mr. GROSS. I think we ought to have a brief explanation of each bill as it is called up and since the gentleman assures us that he will explain each of the bills, I will withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 316 of the Social Security Amendments of 1958 is amended by striking out "July 1, 1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1965".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall be effective as of July 1, 1961.

SEC. 2. Section 218(p) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "Texas," after "Tennessee,".

With the following committee amendments:

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Page 1, strike out lines 6 and 7.

Page 1, after line 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 218(p) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting 'Texas,' after 'Tennessee,' "

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, H.R. 3348 makes two changes in provisions of law relating to the old-age, survivors' and disability insurance program under the Social Security Act.

First, the bill, which was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable STANLEY R. TUPPER, would reopen temporarily a provision of law permitting the State of Maine to treat teaching and nonteaching employees who are actually in the same retirement system as though they were under separate retirement systems for social security coverage purposes. The original provision, enacted as part of the Social Security Amendments of 1958, expired on June 30, 1960, and was reopened until July 1, 1961. The pending bill would reopen the provision until July 1, 1965, thus permitting the State of Maine to complete the desired extensions of coverage.

The second section of the bill, as reported, amends section 218 of the Social Security Act to include Texas in the list of States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen under retirement systems. This provision, which presently includes 18 specified States and all interstate instrumentalities, is completely permissive and makes possible the coverage of groups of policemen and firemen only if the State specifically requests that its coverage agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be modified to provide such coverage, and further, such coverage must be authorized by State law. The Committee on Ways and Means in considering bills of this nature has always been careful to refrain from moving in this area unless it has seemed clear that it was desired by the State in question.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3348, as amended by the Ways and Means Committee, amends the Social Security Act to extend the time during which the State of Maine may modify its existing agreement under the Social Security Act with respect to OASDI coverage for employees under that State's public retirement system. In addition, the bill adds the State of Texas to the list of some 18 States which may provide social security OASDI coverage to policemen and firemen covered under that State's public retirement system.

The legislation merely allows the States of Maine and Texas to qualify under certain provisions of the Social Security Act in the same manner as certain other specified States. Both sections of the bill require implementation on the part of the respective State governments.

Because these two States requested this legislation, I feel that it merits your strong support.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

[Mr. TUPPER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 9393) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, and to validate wages erroneously reported for certain engineering aids employed by soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma, which was also unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 216(i)(2) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "A period of disability shall (subject to section 223(a)(3)) begin—

"(A) on the day the disability began, but only if the individual satisfies the requirements of paragraph (3) on such day; or

"(B) if such individual does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph (3) on such day, then on the first day of the first quarter thereafter in which he satisfies such requirements."

(b) Section 216(i)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "of paragraphs (2) and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "of paragraph (2)".

(c) Section 216(i)(4) of such Act is repealed.

(d)(1) The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply in the case of applications for disability determinations under section 216(i) of the Social Security Act filed after the month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

(2) Except as provided in the succeeding paragraphs, such amendments shall also apply, and as though such amendments had been enacted on July 1, 1962, in the case of applications for disability determinations filed under section 216(i) of the Social Security Act during the period beginning July 1, 1962, and ending with the close of the month following the month in which this Act is enacted, by an individual who—

(A) has been under a disability (as defined in such section 216(i)) continuously since he filed such application and up to (i) the first day of the second month following the month in which this Act is enacted or (ii) if earlier, the first day of the month in which he attained the age of 65, and

(B) is living on the day specified in subparagraph (A)(i).

(3) In the case of an individual to whom paragraph (2) applies and who filed an application for disability insurance benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act during the period specified in such paragraph—

(A) if such individual was under a disability (as defined in section 223(c) of such Act) throughout such period and was not entitled to disability insurance benefits under such section 23 for any month in such period (except for the amendments made by this section), such application and any application filed during such period for benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of such individual shall, notwithstanding section 202(j)(2) and the first sentence of section 223(b), be deemed an effective application, or

(B) if such individual was entitled (without the application of this section (to) disability insurance benefits under section 223 for a continuous period of months immediately preceding—

(i) the second month following the month in which this Act was enacted, or

(ii) if earlier, the month in which he became entitled to benefits under section 202(a),

his primary insurance amount shall be recomputed, but only if such amount would be increased solely by reason of the enactment of this section.

(4) No monthly insurance benefits, and no increase in monthly insurance benefits, may be paid under title II of the Social Security Act by reason of the enactment of this section for any month before the eleventh month before the month in which this Act is enacted.

(5) In the case of an individual (A) who is entitled under section 202 of the Social Security Act (but without the application of subsection (j)(1) of such section) to a widow's, widower's, or parent's insurance benefit, or to an old-age, wife's, or husband's insurance benefit which is reduced under section 202(q) of such Act, for any month in the period referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection, (B) who was under a disability (as defined in section 223(c) of the Social Security Act) which began prior to the sixth month before the first month for which the benefits referred to in clause (A) are payable and which continued through the month following the month in which this Act is enacted, and (C) who files an application for disability insurance benefits under section 233(a)(1) of the Social Security Act—

(i) subsection (a)(3) of section 223 of the Social Security Act shall not prevent him from being entitled to such disability insurance benefits;

(ii) the provisions of subsection (a)(1) of such section 223 terminating entitlement to disability insurance benefits by reason of entitlement to old-age insurance benefits shall not apply with respect to him unless and until he again becomes entitled to such old-age insurance benefits under the provisions of section 202 of such Act;

(iii) such individual shall, for any month for which he is thereby entitled to both old-age insurance benefits and disability insurance benefits, be entitled only to such disability insurance benefits; and

(iv) in case the benefits reduced under subsection (q) of section 202 of such Act are old-age insurance benefits (I) such old-age insurance benefits for the months in the period referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not be recomputed solely by reason of the enactment of this section, and, if otherwise recomputed, the provisions of and amendments made by this section shall not apply to such recomputation; and (II) the months for which he received such old-age insurance benefits before or during the period for which he becomes entitled, by reason of such enactment, to disability insurance benefits under such section 223 and the months for which he received such disability insurance benefits shall be excluded from the "reduction period" and the "adjusted reduction period", as defined in paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively, of such subsection (q) for purposes of determining the amount of the old-age insurance benefits to which he may subsequently become entitled.

(6) The entitlement of any individual to benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act shall not be terminated solely

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Bourbon Whiskey—Coffee: Objection was made to a unanimous-consent request for immediate consideration of S. Con. Res. 19, to designate "Bourbon whiskey" as a distinctive product of the United States, and H.R. 4198, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of soluble and instant coffee. H.R. 2330, to provide that antiques may be imported free of duty if they exceed 100 years of age at time of importation, was not called up. Pages 9408–9410

Program for Monday: Adjourned at 1:57 p.m. until Monday, May 4, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon, when the House will call the Consent Calendar and consider, under suspension of the rules, the following four bills:

H.R. 8078, regarding the Muscatine Bridge Commission;

H.R. 7654, to designate the lock on the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the John A. Blatnik Lock;

H.R. 10053, to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 relating to vessel construction differentials; and

S. 627, to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects.

Committee Meetings

MILITARY HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Hospital Construction held a hearing on problems relating to the construction of military hospital facilities. Heard testimony from Rear Adm. E. C. Kenney, Surgeon General of the Navy; and Maj. Gen. Richard L. Bohannon, Surgeon General of the USAF.

FOREIGN AID

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Continued a hearing on foreign aid, and heard testimony from public witnesses. Recessed until Friday, May 1.

POLYGRAPHS

Committee on Government Operations: Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information held a hearing on the use of polygraphs in the Federal Government. Heard testimony from public witnesses.

PUBLIC LANDS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Public Lands held a hearing on H.R. 9162, "to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people." Heard testimony from public witnesses.

PRAYER—PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Committee on the Judiciary: Continued hearings on pending resolutions regarding prayer and Bible reading in schools and in other public places. Heard testimony from Representative Fino, Governor Wallace, of Alabama; and public witnesses.

FEDERAL PAY RAISE

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Met in executive session and ordered reported favorably to the House H.R. 11049, the Federal pay raise bill.

PROJECT RANGER

Committee on Science and Astronautics: Subcommittee on National Aeronautics and Space Administration Oversight held a hearing regarding the investigation of Project Ranger. Heard testimony from public witnesses.

HOSPITALS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Hospitals held a hearing on various hospital and medical program bills. Heard testimony from public witnesses.

Joint Committee Meetings

KINZUA DAM—SENECA INDIANS

Conferees met in executive session to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 1794, authorizing payment of funds to Seneca Nation for rights-of-way over lands of the Allegany Indian Reservation for the Kinzua Dam project, but did not reach agreement, and announced that they would resume its consideration next week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 1

(*All meetings are open unless otherwise designated*)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations, subcommittee, on fiscal 1965 budget estimates for independent offices, 8:30 a.m., room S–128, Capitol.

Subcommittee, on fiscal 1965 budget estimates for public works, 8:30 a.m., 1114 New Senate Office Building.

Subcommittee, on fiscal 1965 budget estimates for the State Department, 9 a.m., room S–126, Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, Military Construction Subcommittee, on H.R. 10300, military construction authorizations bill, 8:30 a.m., 212 Old Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, executive, 10 a.m., H–302 U.S. Capitol Building.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Real Estate and Construction, executive, on current real estate projects, 10 a.m., 304 Cannon House Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, on foreign aid, 10 a.m., H–322 U.S. Capitol Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Public Lands, to continue hearings on wilderness legislation, 9:45 a.m., 1324 Longworth House Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, on pending resolutions regarding prayer and Bible reading in public schools and in other public places, 10 a.m., 346 Cannon House Office Building.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Congressional Record

The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time.

The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue.

Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets.

With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

board of selection, which chose the 21 churches and temples comprising the exhibit from more than 160 submissions from this country and abroad, says:

Perhaps the significance to be perceived in this collection is the unremitting search for appropriate form by architects of religious buildings. In this age we can no longer repeat styles, but must find concepts for houses of worship that are meaningful for congregations of today and tomorrow. The architects whose work is represented in this exhibit feel that they have done this, or at least have indicated paths to be followed for the religious architecture of the future.

This is but one of a number of public service activities in which the AIA's New York chapter has engaged. Some of its more significant and recent efforts also deserve attention.

Through the chapter and its women's auxiliary well over $10,000 is awarded each year in the form of scholarships and fellowships. Among these is the Arnold W. Brunner Scholarship, calling for study in a field which will contribute to the advancement of the architectural profession. Grants have been made for a study of urban living, new means of communication which will facilitate architectural design, and many others. This past year the scholarship was given for a study of Government control of architecture in European countries. In making the award, Geoffry N. Lawford, president of the chapter, said:

With the intensive growth of our cities and our citizens' increasing concern with better architecture and improved city planning, the role of legislative controls is of vital interest.

The chapter recently completed a 3-year study of the hospital operating area. Out of this research program, which was made possible through a grant to the chapter by the Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities of the U.S. Public Health Service, evolved a new concept in planning hospital surgical facilities. The new design approach calls for the development, within the hospital, of a nearly self-contained surgical center capable of caring for patients from admission to completion of their postoperative recovery period. While patients would continue to use the hospital's standard nursing units for convalescence, many minor cases would never even require assignment to a hospital room.

Specifically designed to give hospitals better control over wound infection, by limiting the patient's and staff's exposure to contamination, the "surgical center" is expected to provide additional benefits. Among these are faster handling of urgent cases, increased efficiency, improvement in the patient's emotional environment, better use of personnel, and increased surgical service capacity. The U.S. Public Health Service has awarded research funds to develop the first surgical center at Montefiore Hospital in the Bronx. The research study was conducted under the auspices of the AIA chapter's hospital and health committee. It was assisted by an advisory board composed of persons distinguished in their work in preventive medicine, surgery, administration, and other pertinent areas.

During the year the hospital and health committee conducts a program to broaden the architect's knowledge of the latest hospital problems and procedures. Through hospital tours, meetings, and speakers, it also contributes to an exchange of ideas between hospital representatives and architects. It is currently developing a seminar on hospital planning to prevent sepsis.

Our schools comprise another area of prime importance. Making a contribution here is the chapter's school committee. Last year it jointly sponsored with the Board of Education of the City of New York a 2-day seminar on the unique problems of planning schools in a big city. Leading educators and architects in the fields of research, administration, and design participated. The aim of the seminar was to find ways of improving educational and architectural standards for urban schools.

Each year the house consulting committee of the chapter holds a design competition to stimulate an appreciation of attractive and efficient house design and to arouse the public to the importance of good architectural design in daily living.

An urban design committee keeps constantly abreast of what is happening in the city with regard to zoning, parks, and other matters which affect the planning and development of New York. As a result, the chapter has given its support to a proposal for a new civic center, a park at Breezy Point, promoted the idea of converting Ellis Island to a memorial park which would be in keeping with its historical associations, and was very active in fighting for passage of a modern zoning code for the city.

The chapter joined with the American Management Association in developing a national conference on design. Prior to that it sponsored the first conference on aesthetic responsibility.

It would take far too long to detail the many other public spirited activities of this organization and its committees. Therefore, I have limited myself to some of the more significant efforts.

The New York chapter of American Institute of Architects, representing more than 1,400 members, many of them known throughout this country and the world for their work, can serve as a model and inspiration to other organizations on city, State, and National levels. Its members and its officers are to be congratulated for public spirited efforts as this chapter enters its 97th year of service to its profession, its members, and the general public.

New Pay Bill for Postal and Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. HEALEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] has introduced a new Federal pay bill (H.R. 10700) for our consideration.

This new bill represents a constructive and intelligent compromise over the bill which this body did not see fit to approve last month. It reduces the proposed pay increase for Members of the Congress and for Federal judges from $10,000 to $7,500 and it delays the effective date for these two categories until January 1, 1965. It maintains the same provisions for postal and Federal workers that were in the original bill, with an effective date of July 1, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, I supported the original Federal pay bill and I shall support this one.

I know the disappointment and discouragement which filled the hearts of postal workers in my district when this body disapproved of the original pay bill. These people need a pay raise. They need it badly. The Congress had promised them this pay raise when it had passed the pay reform bill of 1962. Postal workers and Federal workers felt, quite rightly, that Congress owed them a debt of honor and that this debt had been repudiated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity of redeeming our honor by passing a bill that deserves the enthusiastic support of every Member of this House. The bill follows the recommendations which the late President Kennedy made to the Congress a year ago this month. It also follows the recommendations which President Johnson has made to the Congress. It is a fine bill; a constructive bill and a deserving bill.

I intend to do everything in my power to help achieve its passage.

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. ABELE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, I shall leave the eulogies of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to those Members of the Congress who had greater personal contact with that great patriot. I simply wish to express the deep feeling of loss felt by the people of the 10th District of Ohio by the passing of General MacArthur. I know that I speak for all of them in expressing our condolences to the late general of the Army's family. Certainly they should know that we share their great sorrow.

I first heard the words of Douglas MacArthur when I attended the Republican National Convention of 1952. I shall always remember the keynote address that he gave there. His inspiration carried us on to victory at the polls in November of that year.

I would quote two paragraphs from that speech. The words are nonpartisan. In the future, it would be well if we kept ourselves constantly reminded of the following words of General of the Army MacArthur as they were given by him at

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

that Republican National Convention of 1952:

Spiritually and physically we possess the resource, properly conserved and realistically applied, to lead toward a world freed from the exhausting wars which have so plagued the past. This is a practical purpose, not visionary. For the destructiveness of modern war has now in the atomic age become too frightful to contemplate by even a potential victor.

This, then, must be the direction of our foreign policy. We must, upon restoration of our military strength and spiritual balance recklessly dissipated in our headlong retreat from victory, chart from that strength a true and unequivocal course to peace and tranquility—a peace and tranquility which will be real, not fictitious; deep-rooted, not superficial. Our ideal must be eventually the abolition of war. Such is the longing hope of all the masses of mankind of whatever race or tribe. Indeed, so well is this understood that even the despot in order to assure a following cloaks the threat or application of force with the hypothetical pretense that his purpose is to secure the peace.

We should all heed well the words of this great American. We should continue to develop all of our resources that we may remain strong enough to maintain the peace.

I would suggest that a committee be formed to create a suitable memorial to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. To be in keeping with his character, it should be one that can be used to some practical purpose.

A Doleful TV Tale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 8, 1964

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, once more we come to the baffling confusion that seems inevitable in Government by commission, which shows up again in this very calm and factual article by Vermont Royster, that appeared in the Wall Street Journal of April 7.

It seems that in this matter of licenses for TV and radio, the FCC is damned if it does and damned if it does not:

THINKING THINGS OVER: A DOLEFUL TV TALE
(By Vermont Royster)

Sometimes we just cannot help feeling sorry for the gentlemen who make up the Federal Communications Commission.

If there ever was a political hot seat, they are on it, what with their power to give or take away television licenses, those little pieces of paper which have become permits to coin money. And now a concatenation of circumstances involving the fortunes of Lyndon Johnson makes it almost certain they will get burned whether they sit still, squirm, or try to get off.

Briefly, the tangled plot of this television soap opera runs like this:

Back in 1943, when Lyndon Johnson was a young Congressman fresh out of the Navy, his wife bought a small radio station in Austin, Tex., for $17,500. At the time it did not seem much of a deal since station KTBC had a limited license and lost money.

What followed, though, was a Horatio Alger success story. Mrs. Johnson quickly won an unlimited license from the FCC and a network affiliation with CBS, turning red ink into black. Later there came a television license, the acquisition of other stations, affiliation with the two other networks, and FCC permission to boost transmitting power.

Meanwhile, other aspirants for stations in the Austin area got discouraged about the necessary FCC clearance for any competing stations. So some 20 years later the L.B.J. Co., as it was called until recently, found itself with exclusive broadcasting rights in this rich central Texas area and with a balance sheet measured in millions.

No breath of scandal marred this success story. Lyndon Johnson, on the record, owned no part of his wife's prosperous business, and neither as Congressman nor as Senator did he ever say a word on her behalf to the FCC, even when he was chairman of the Senate committee handling FCC business.

But in every television tale, as in the Alger stories, a little rain must fall. Just as another challenger appeared on the Austin TV scene—this time a company that "pipes in" TV shows from out of town—Lyndon Johnson wound up in the White House.

It's doubtful if this complication bothers Mr. Johnson, or Lady Bird either. But it puts the FCC in an excruciating position.

The other company presently has a license to pipe in to Austin some TV shows but it is prohibited from offering its customers (who receive programs by cable into their homes) any of the network programs the Johnson station might offer but doesn't until at least 15 days after the Johnson station has passed up the opportunity. This restriction, which protects the Johnson station, is what is now at issue.

If the Commissioners don't lift the restriction, they'll be burned for allegedly protecting the Johnson "monopoly." If they do, there'll be hot howls from previous would-be entrants who were denied access to the Austin market and also scorching accusations that the gentlemen of the Commission are reversing established policies just to avoid the charges of favoritism.

So they're dammed if they do and dammed if they don't which is certainly the stuff of which dramatic plots are made.

Even so, our sympathy for their plight is dampened somewhat by that feeling we often get watching TV playlets—you know, the feeling that if the characters in the tale had acted a little more sensibly they wouldn't be in such a fix.

The only excuse for putting TV stations under a licensing system anyway is a technical one. That is, in the VHF wave spectrum, which is currently the main one for commercial broadcasts, there is room for only so many stations.

Except for this technical problem there is no more reason for a Government rationing agency for TV than for a Federal bureau to decide how many shoe stores, barber shops, newspapers, or movie houses should be allowed in a given town.

But as so often happens, somewhere along the line policies that had some sense in them turned ridiculous. Today if you apply for a TV license in Middletown, U.S.A., the Commission isn't content with just deciding if there is air room for you to operate without jamming another station. The Commission also tries to decide if there's room enough for competition. And at this point, the whole thing becomes utter nonsense.

Back in 1948 the FCC suspended granting any new TV channel allocations, technical considerations or no technical considerations, while it launched a "study" of what was the "right" number of stations per capita and where they should be located. Subsequently it evolved some guidelines, which we don't profess to understand and which no Commissioner can logically expain, that would limit the number of stations on population ratios and all that sort of thing.

Here the Commission doesn't pretend that it is doing anything but acting "to protect local television stations from competition." In other words, the fellow who's already there has got it made—at least for as long as the Commissioners are happy with him.

No wonder TV stations sell for fabulous sums. It's not the physical plant but the Government license that's worth a mint. No wonder that present owners are satisfied with the policy. No wonder, either, that they live in trepidation of displeasing the Commission, for what the Commission gives the Commission can take away. These licenses to coin money, remember, are renewable.

And no wonder the Commissioners get perplexed trying to decide who gets rich and who doesn't. Solomon would be confused.

The Johnson case, therefore, isn't unique. True, delivering TV shows to people's homes in Austin by rented cable wouldn't interfere with the KTBC–TV signal: it would only interfere with the station's exclusive rights to a captive audience. But in shielding KTBC–TV from the winds of competition the Commissioners aren't singling out the Johnson company for favortism or, for that matter, picking on just Austin audiences in depriving them of a wider choice of TV shows. Under FCC policies, it happens all over.

That the Commissioners, nice gentlemen all, should now find themselves tangled in the toils of presidential politics is just hapless fortune, and we'll watch with sympathy as they try to untangle it. Still, it's just like all those TV plots—take away the foolishness and there'd be no doleful tale to tell.

Authorizing Appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. WYDLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 25, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10456) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, the NASA authorization bill before Congress represents this Nation's investment in the conquest of space. As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House of Representatives, I support the high priority given this program.

Outside of defense spending, this Federal space program represents our largest single expenditure—over $5 billion.

The responsibility for this programs is awesome. The Space Agency is expanding at an enormous rate. Yet, I am convinced that the men doing the job are sincere, dedicated, and competent. They have obtained excellent overall results of which all Americans can be proud.

In paying this general compliment, I must express some reservations and specific criticisms.

First, I have joined with my colleagues on the Committee in separate views on

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

plan has been approved by the local governing body, and that such approval must contain findings by that body that—as the code states:

(i) the financial aid to be provided in the contract is necessary to enable the project to be undertaken in accordance with the urban renewal plan,"

(ii) the urban renewal plan will afford maximum opportunity, consistent with the sound needs of the locality as a whole, for the rehabilitation or redevelopment of the urban renewal area by private enterprise,"

(iii) the urban renewal plan conforms to a general plan for the development of the locality as a whole."

In my opinion, none of these criteria have been met, on the facts that I have available to me. There has been no estimate of cost of acquiring the land through eminent domain, and no comparison of that cost with that of renting from a private developer for the same purpose. Under the circumstances, no one could possibly find that the first criteria of the need of Government assistance had been met.

Secondly, the plan for this 12.8-acre tract makes no arrangements at all for private enterprise development instead of purchase and resale by the Government to a favored party. The question has not even been explored, if the newspaper reports are true.

Thirdly, the stock exchange approached the housing body to create an urban renewal plan for that particular area for that particular purpose. It can hardly be said that this project and purpose was anticipated in any general plan for the community as a whole. There is no evidence, moreover, that this new exchange via urban renewal is necessary to keep the exchange in New York City, or to increase the intake of property taxes, or to stimulate new business. On the contrary, realtors in the area are complaining that any move, even 400 yards away, would hurt present office and commercial establishments.

Mr. Speaker, this is a prime example of how far afield we have gone in the urban renewal program. No longer are we helping the needy, no longer are we concerned with the ill-housed, the small businessman, the minority groups. I would like to see any administration official go into the rent strike areas of Harlem, or Cleveland, or the Nation's Capital for that matter, and tell them why money that should be spent to meet their needs is being spent elsewhere to benefit the New York Stock Exchange and other commercial ventures that could well afford to help themselves. This is precisely why the Republican housing proposal includes a specific set of priorities, placing housing first, and commercial redevelopment on a loan basis.

There is another thing that worries me, however. We are told that urban renewal projects are the result of local decisions and local initiative, and are solemnly assured that no Federal official attempts to "sell" the program. Yet here we have a situation where it is reported that Federal urban renewal officials gave tentative approval to a plan having nothing to do with the purpose of urban renewal, and they did so even before the city officials acted. I would like to know who these Federal officials are, what contacts were made, what promises given, and what influence an apparent prior Federal approval had on the city board of estimate. As far as I am concerned, such conduct is out of line with their official duties, and if true, should be sufficient to end their employment by the American taxpayer.

The Wall Street Journal article of April 10, 1964, follows:

NEW YORK UNIT VOTES URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR BIG BOARD'S PROPOSED NEW QUARTERS

(By Laurence G. O'Donnell)

NEW YORK.—An urban renewal plan, under which New York City will acquire 12.8 acres as a site for the New York Stock Exchange's new headquarters, was approved unanimously by the city's board of estimate.

The decision clears the way for the slum clearance plan, which already has tentative approval of Federal urban renewal officials.

But it may take years for the site to be acquired from its present owners, chiefly a group headed by John P. McGrath, a lawyer and former city corporation counsel, and Sol Atlas, a real estate developer. They oppose the urban renewal plan.

The land, at Manhattan's southern tip, will have to be taken from the present owners through court condemnation proceedings, unless these owners come to terms with the city out of court. There was no indication yesterday that this would happen.

CALLED UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. McGrath renewed his objection to the plan, arguing that it was unconstitutional and contrary to the intent of the urban renewal program to take rundown property from private owners—who planned to redevelop it themselves—and then turn it over to a private business organization, such as a stock exchange. Such condemnation, Mr. McGrath argued, would be unique.

He said his group, which wants to build a 40-story office building on a portion of the site, would lease or sell land to the exchange large enough to house its new trading floor. He asserted that the exchange could get its site cheaper this way than through condemnation. The exchange could rent office space in the building.

Mr. McGrath also proposed that officials of the exchange and the city's housing and redevelopment board, its urban renewal agency, meet with the present owners in an effort to make a deal and avoid condemnation proceedings.

But neither an exchange spokesman nor the head of the housing board expressed any interest in Mr. McGrath's proposal.

DISCUSSED COSTS

Members of the board of estimate spent much of the hearing trying to find out whether the big board knew how much it thought it would cost to acquire the site through condemnation or had any interest in occupying facilities owned by a private developer.

Charles Klem, a vice president of the exchange, said big board officials were not convinced that acquiring the site through a private developer would be cheaper, but added that if shown that it was, the lower cost would be a factor to be weighed but it might not be a controlling factor. He indicated the big board was willing to pay whatever the court awarded.

One member of the board of estimate, Edward Cavanaugh, deputy mayor, charged Mr. Klem with being "sort of whimsical" and "a little vague on the matter of costs."

Milton Mollen, chairman of the housing board, brought out that it was the exchange that wanted to acquire the site through urban renewal and build its own facilities, so that it wouldn't have to rent space. Mr. Klem agreed with the description of the exchange's position.

Mr. Klem's appearance was the first by an exchange official before a public hearing on the urban renewal plan. Previously the exchange declined to comment on charges raised at the hearings.

RAISES QUESTIONS

Mr. Mollen also disputed Mr. McGrath's contention that condemnation of property for resale to the exchange was unconstitutional. He indirectly raised questions about the McGrath group's intentions when it started to assemble the site in the spring of 1962.

The housing official cited early 1962 newspaper articles reporting the big board's interest in the site at Manhattan's tip after the city rejected it as a luxury housing area. Mr. McGrath had argued that the land gathering started after the decision on luxury housing but long before the exchange announced in late December 1962 that it had signed a letter of intent with the housing board to acquire the site and redevelop it with a new trading facility. "This wasn't the case of opportunistic speculators moving ing in" he said.

Mr. McGrath also charged that he had been rebuffed in his efforts to make a proposal to the exchange. Instead, he said, he was shunted back and forth between the exchange's real estate consultants who he contended unofficially endorsed his plan, and the housing board.

Strenuous objections to the urban renewal plan also were expressed by owners and operators of office buildings near the existing exchange, some 400 yards north of the urban renewal area. They contended values of their holdings would be hurt when the exchange left Wall Street for the new site. The move would create vacancies, already high in some of the buildings, as brokerage houses and others sought new quarters, possibly in new buildings that may be built, near the new headquarters, the owners argued. These real estate interests included Tenney Corp., Franchard Corp., and Real Properties Corp. of America, all real estate investment companies.

(Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. BELL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. WIDNALL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Pay Bill

PAY RAISE—PRAISE FOR A "NO" VOTE FROM FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. BELL) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that a Congressman receives a letter from his district from one who works for the Federal Government and who applauds a Congressman for voting against a pay raise that affects the constituent. For this reason, I am pleased and proud to report that several of my constituents whose pay was not increased have assured me that they thought my vote against the pay raise bill this year was correct. One such person in particular wrote me a thoughtful letter and

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

has given me permission to publicize this letter, which I do so now.

CONCORD, N.H.,
March 19, 1964.

Hon. JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLEVELAND: Congress has my wholehearted approval in rejecting the recent pay bill, by which its Members and other Government employees would have received substantial raises.

Let us not be concerned about pay increases for our already, in my opinion, well-paid Government workers when there is so much unemployment, unequality, and hardship in our land.

I should like to point out that all of the federally paid employees I know are earning far in excess of those employees of private industry or State and local municipalities who must contribute heavily in tax dollars toward these salaries. New Hampshire State employees receive salaries far less than those of Government employees doing comparable work—for 11 years I worked for our State and observed this firsthand. As a matter of fact, federally paid employees also enjoy more generous fringe benefits than do employees of most other establishments.

Government workers received a liberal raise only 2 months ago under the second phase of the 1962 Salary Act, and to have granted them an additional increase in pay now would have been completely unrealistic, unjustified, and unnecessary.

Please continue to help Uncle Sam to wisely and prudently spend our hard-earned tax dollars—as President Johnson only last Sunday indicated that to do so was his desire and objective aim. We taxpayers are proud of America and its leaders and want our country to be economically sound.

I feel I am fully justified in expressing my opinion in this way because I am a Government employee, and have been for nearly 9 years.

Sincerely yours,

EDNA WEEKS.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH DR. HELLER ON THE WAGE-PRICE GUIDELINES

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. BELL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, I wrote to Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, inquiring about an article from the Wall Street Journal relating to the implementation of the administration's wage-price guidelines. On April 3, Chairman Heller replied to my letter. I have now replied to his.

Because of the critical importance of the wage-price guidelines, I think it would increase public understanding of administration policy if this correspondence were made generally available. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence to which I have referred, as well as a copy of the Wall Street Journal article, be included in the RECORD at this point. I also ask unanimous consent that a question on the wage-price guidelines which I submitted to Dr. Heller on January 23, along with his reply, also be included in the RECORD at this point.

APRIL 17, 1964.

Dr. WALTER W. HELLER,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers,
Executive Office of the President,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HELLER: Thank you for your reply of April 3 to my letter of March 23, inquiring about a Wall Street Journal report that the administration's price-wage early warning system was going into high gear.

Contrary to the impression I received from the Journal story, I infer from your letter that the early warning system and the implementation of the guidelines has not developed beyond your reply to my question on the same subject submitted to you on January 23.

The drawing up of wage-price guidelines by the Council and the administration's stated determination that unions and management must abide by them is an important departure from existing practice and has vast implications for the future relationship between the public and private sectors. It is my hope that our correspondence will help to promote public understanding of administration policy in the vital area of price and wage decisionmaking.

At the moment, this understanding is imprecise and vague. The Council has, to be sure, spelled out the guidelines in some detail in its recent economic reports. How the guidelines will be implemented remains more of a mystery.

Your letter, for example, says that the purpose of the early warning system is to enable the administration to inform itself on situations to which further attention might need be given. In your reply to my question of January 23, you said that the idea was to keep the President informed of industry situations that threaten to overstep the bounds of responsible price and wagemaking. Such situations, you said, "if serious enough, would become candidates for further administration consideration."

Two questions arise. In the first place, what standards will determine whether a particular price or wage decision needs "further attention" or becomes a "candidate" for further consideration? I take it from your statement that not every situation that exceeds the guidelines will automatically fall into this category. Except for government, the rules of the game will not be known to the players. The result is intolerable uncertainty that is patently unfair as well as potentially damaging to the smooth functioning of our economy. Discriminatory abuse of its powers by government is also an ever-present and disturbing possibility.

In the second place, what type of action does the administration plan to take in those situations where it feels that some action is called for? Your reply to my question of January 23 stated that "specific means by which the President might wish to focus public attention on particular situations, and otherwise convey his interest and concern to the parties involved, would, of course, be up to the President."

Evidently the administration expects to take action against what it deems to be serious infractions of the guidelines by invoking the power and prestige of the Presidency. At the moment, the methods by which the President will resist objectionable wage and price decisions are inscrutable. You have assured me, however, that there would be no repitition of the unfortunate 1962 steel episode.

What is clear is that the parties to a particular wage and price situation will not know in advance either the nature of the behavior which will set off a Presidential response or what the nature of that response might be. Among the many objections to this procedure—aside from the fact that it is not based upon a statutory grant of authority—is that the impossibly heavy burden of implementation placed upon the Presidency is certain to weaken both the authority and the prestige of that high office.

I feel certain that you share my view that the public has the right to know as well as the need to know precisely what the administration's policy is as it unfolds.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

P.S.—I think it would be particularly helpful to relate the wage-price guidelines to the biggest single employer in our economy, the Federal Government, in light of the administration's sponsoring the general Federal employee pay increase legislation at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, April 3, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: The "early warning system" referred to in the Wall Street Journal article of March 20, evidently refers to the administration's efforts to expedite the reporting of particular price and wage changes already put into effect, or announced and not yet put into effect, or being contemplated but not yet decided. The purpose of these efforts is for the administration to inform itself in timely fashion as to current and prospective developments so that it may identify and assess situations to which further attention might need be given.

This effort was described in our reply to one of the questions you submitted to the Council at the JEC hearings on the economic report. In reply to your question No. 13, we noted that "making use of this information, senior officials of the same agencies will identify, and keep the President informed of, industry situations that threaten to overstep the bounds of responsible price and wage making. Such situations, if serious enough, would become candidates for further administration consideration. The specific means by which the President might wish to focus public attention on particular situations, and otherwise convey his interest and concern to the parties involved, would of course be up to the President" (hearings, pp. 21–22).

We do not know what might be the basis for the assertion that 15 major industries are "under special scrutiny." Conceivably, this idea might be based on the fact that an analysis of actual and preferred rates of operation and output expectations for 15 broad sectors of manufacturing was presented as part of our reply to another of the questions you submitted at the Joint Economic Committee hearings. Your question was: "Do you have a breakdown of industries which are operating at or near their preferred operating rate? Is it not true that too sharp of an expansion would cause price pressures in these industries which would tend to spill over into other sectors of the economy?" There was no implication in our response that the 15 manufacturing industries were under special scrutiny. Indeed, these 15 sectors represent practically the whole of manufacturing.

In reply to your final question, I can assure you that our "early warning system" is concerned equally with price and wage developments. The administration is scrutinizing all forthcoming major collective bargaining situations in terms of the public interest.

As President Johnson said last week to the United Automobile Workers, and, indirectly, to employers and unions in all industries:

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

While this deals with civil cases, it points out how the thing balances out, how the judge and the jury, each performing their separate function, and functioning as directed by law under our judicial system, work as a check and balance, and thus further serve the cause of justice, rather than detract from it.

He stated:

They had a tendency not to hold a plaintiff 100 percent responsible when there was only contributory negligence.

Under some State laws, we have the statute of comparative negligence, where the amount of recovery is diminished in proportion to the contributory negligence of the plaintiff.

He goes on to say:

In later instances we have found that the juries return a number of verdicts for the defendant when the court is not directing them. The latest study in Detroit showed that there was a substantially higher number of defendants' verdicts after this change. So the jury can work to relieve the harshness at both ends. Although the new view may seem harsh, the jury tends to ameliorate this by taking the middle ground. This was true in earlier cases as well, for the jury then tended to take the middle ground also.

Another title in the books is, "The American Citizen and the Jury." Dean Joiner says:

The jury is a vestige of nonprofessional government, an institution in which nongovernmental people play a significant part in the governmental process. Here private citizens on an ad hoc basis exercise part of the dispute resolution responsibility of government, thus minimizing any biases of governmental bureacracy. It is popular because it gives private citizens a broad participation in government. A significant job is performed without hiring new governmental employees or creating a new hierarchy. The jury provides for citizen participation in government unequaled elsewhere. If democracy is really to work—and it has worked pretty well for 170 years—our citizens must not only be informed at election time but must know the meaning of making responsible decisions. Through the jury more private citizens participate in responsible decisionmaking than in all government put together. Certainly the decision of a juror is a responsible one, and he realizes it; and when he has seen the difficulty in making it, he cannot help but understand some of the problems that others, such as government officials, face when they have to make even more significant decisions than his. However, responsible decisionmaking by jurors is possible only when they have the qualifications for decisionmaking.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator agree with the statement of Mr. Goldfarb, of the Department of Justice, in his book published recently by the Columbia University Press entitled "The Contempt Power," in which book Mr. Goldfarb makes the following declaration:

It could well be suggested that, most peculiarly, in contempt cases the jury has a valuable role. First, it brings the public's attention and interest to a dispute which is usually an official, governmental one. Public enlightenment, even if only through jury representation, has been characterized as an "indispensable element in the popular vindication of the criminal law." This participation hopefully encourages popular understanding and acceptance of the administration of justice. Second, the jury may serve as an insulation between the alleged offender and the offended party, who is sometimes the judge and sentencer.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Dean Joiner has one section of his book which deals with the subject "The Jury as the Conscience of the Community."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator agree with Mr. Goldfarb on this statement:

This conservative deliberation in an otherwise unlimited, uncontrolled situation allows the jury to function as a wall against possible abuses by governmental powerholders upon individuals. The general public may look with skepticism upon a judicial process which allows one man to be judge, prosecutor, victim, and jury, but as Justice Black aptly pointed out, there is inclined to be less false martyrdom where a jury convicts.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the comment. The more we think about this issue and contemplate the consequences of what is proposed to be done here, the more we need to go back and reevaluate, reappraise, and reassess our own thinking and our own consideration of what our duty is, and the value that has been placed on the right of trial by jury throughout the whole history of this country. Dean Joiner has a title in his book, "The Jury as the Conscience of the Community." In this respect, he said:

In this section I will try to show that the jury has a second significant function that can be served in no other way than by drawing a number of persons from the community at large. This is the function of acting as the conscience of the community in dispute resolution.

A judge might well exercise the function acting as the conscience of the community. I do not say that he would not or could not. But I do say that it is more likely that 12 good men, tried and true, duly selected by the jury processes to serve in a given case, will more often reflect the conscience of the community than would a single judge.

Mr. Joiner states:

"Conscience of the community" involves bringing a cross section of the community into the process of dispute resolution. An understanding of the ideas involved in this section necessitates an acceptance of four major premises. When these are accepted, I think the conclusion is inevitable:

1. The jury as we know it is drawn from the community at large.

2. The judge is also selected from the community.

3. Most laws are written in very general terms.

4. The law requires communitywide acceptance.

Mr. President, I have not elaborated under each one of those four reasons that the author has assigned. He has provided a very able comment in support of each one. He closes by saying:

These four premises, that the jury comes from the community and is a reasonably fair cross section of that community, that the judge is an expert coming from the elite of the community, that the law is often very general in its terms, needing precise interpretation and application in individual cases, and that it needs to have strong popular support in the community itself, lead inevitably to the conclusion that the litigious process must somehow involve the community and that the jury is probably the best device possible to bring out this community spirit, this community consciousness of the law. Imperfect as the jury system may be, it is far better than having harsh, rigid standards that are not perfectly applicable to a case before the court, or having an unsympathetic member of an elite interpret the laws. It is the jury that helps resolve disputes in accordance with the law which it has interpreted in a way that will maintain popular support for it and the legal system, thus helping to build and shape the application of general laws in a way that will be widely accepted.

Almost 100 years ago, Mr. Justice Hunt, speaking in support of a unanimous Supreme Court of the United States, expressed this thought:

"Twelve men of the average of the community, comprising men of education and men of little education, men of learning and men whose learning consists only in what they have themselves seen and heard, the merchant, the mechanic, the farmer, the laborer; these sit together, consult, apply their separate experience of the affairs of life to the facts proven, and draw a unanimous conclusion. This average judgment thus given it is the great effort of the law to obtain. It is assumed that 12 men know more of the common affairs of life than does one man, that they can draw wiser and safer conclusions from admitted facts thus occurring than can a single judge."

Mr. President, I assume that there will be further opportunity to speak, and if anyone is still in doubt, surely there is further necessity for discussing the issue. I hope that there will be further discussion of it before a vote is taken on the pending amendment or on any other amendment involving the issue, because the subject is too important for us to make any mistake about it. I believe the more some of us discuss it and the more those others who do not discuss it reflect upon it, the more likely we will come to a correct decision.

Mr. President, there seem to be other Senators who want to speak this evening. I dislike to impose upon their rights, and thus I feel I should bring my address today to a conclusion, so as to give them an opportunity to participate in the debate on the vital issue now before the Senate.

So much has been said that I think there is more heat than hate existing. A few days ago I made reference to some of the editorials appearing in one of the great newspapers of my State, the Arkansas Democrat. I commented on one of them in particular. I find there is another that I think has a proper place in the RECORD of this debate. It appeared in the Arkansas Democrat of last Tuesday, May 12, 1964. It reads:

[From the Arkansas Democrat, May 12, 1964]

SUGGESTION FOR PRESIDENTIAL LECTURE

Next time President Johnson feels the urge coming on him to lecture the public on its duties, we wish he'd turn his attention to the U.S. Supreme Court—then to the Senate

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

for its perfunctory approval of presidential nominees to the Court.

The President delivered what the AP called a "scorching blast" at hate in a speech in New York City last weekend. He said hate is a national menace.

What the President loosely calls hate is the feeling roused by the results of the Supreme Court's racial rulings in the past 10 years. The Senate bears responsibility for this because it has failed to use its coequal power with the President to name the Court Justices.

But there's very little real hate among Americans toward people. They are too innately kind and generous. They may hate things—like communism and crime, as they should.

People often say they hate someone when what they actually feel is dislike, anger, indignation, scorn or repulsion. Hate, says Webster's Dictionary of Synonyms, "implies extreme aversion, especially as coupled with malice" and includes such other feelings as rancor, vindictiveness or fear.

A great many Americans resent the Supreme Court's upheaving racial decisions. They are angry, indignant, sometimes bitter about them.

And they feel the same way about racial agitators who defy local authority, often break down peace and order and cause rioting and violence. But very few Americans feel the blind wrath of hate.

If President Johnson wants to call this hate, let him take much of the blame home to himself. For he is aggravating it with his civil rights bill, which would impair all rights to force the demands of willful peace-breaking and lawbreaking agitators on the nation.

If he wants to remove this "hate," let him take his pressure from behind the civil rights bill and speak out for Court and senatorial and House respect of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 238 Leg.]

Aiken	Hartke	McGee
Allott	Hayden	McNamara
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Metcalf
Bayh	Hill	Miller
Bible	Holland	Monroney
Boggs	Hruska	Neuberger
Burdick	Humphrey	Prouty
Cannon	Inouye	Proxmire
Case	Jackson	Randolph
Clark	Johnston	Ribicoff
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Cotton	Keating	Scott
Dodd	Kennedy	Simpson
Douglas	Lausche	Smith
Ervin	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Fong	Long, La.	Symington
Gore	Mansfield	Walters
Gruening	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Hart	McClellan	Williams, Del.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

PROPOSED FEDERAL PAY INCREASE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to express opposition to the bill which proposes a pay increase for Federal employees, judges, Cabinet members, Members of Congress, and others. I do so on the basis that one of the principal concerns of all responsible officials is the need of holding the line against price increases which may be precipitated by the improper judgment of vendors or by unjustified wage increases as they are related to the recommendations made by the President and the Council of Economic Advisers. Whatever I have heard spoken on this subject has been directed primarily against the need to avoid inflation. All persons occupying responsible positions, excluding those concerned with the international threat, have rather uniformly stated that our primary problem in this period is to stop the pent-up powers that are ready to explode and cause inordinate increases in the prices of goods which the public buys.

Because we are concerned about private employment for the unemployed, it occurs to me that one of the best methods of providing work for the unemployed would be to guarantee an expanded market in which our people would be able to buy, and in which producers throughout the world would be desirous of buying our goods because of their favorable price. With that premise, I suggest that that is no justification for Members of Congress to ask for a 33⅓-percent pay increase, for for Congress to set an example that would induce labor leaders and manufacturers to disregard the plea that has been made about fixing prices and wages at a point where the increased cost shall not be beyond the productivity of the labor placed into the goods

I shall read excerpts from the economic report transmitted by the President to Congress in January 1964. In that report, President Johnson said:

A series of specific price increases in recent months—especially in manufactured goods—gives me some cause for concern.

I do not anticipate a renewal of the price-wage spiral—a spiral that would weaken our expansion and worsen our balance-of-payments position.

I count on the sense of responsibility of the Nation's industrialists and labor leaders (1) to extend the excellent price and cost records of recent years and (2) to maintain price and wage policies that accord with the non-inflationary guideposts that I have asked the Council of Economic Advisors to reaffirm in its attached report.

The President further said:

On the heels of solid increases in real wages, plus the rise in take-home pay under the tax cut, I see no warrant for inflationary wage increases. Accordingly, I shall keep a close watch on price and wage developments with the aid of an early warning system which is being set up in the appropriate agencies.

I shall not hesitate to draw public attention to major actions by either business or labor that flout the public interest in non-inflationary price and wage standards.

The President further said:

On March 23, in Atlantic City, the President said:

Broader public interest today, more than ever, requires that the stability of our costs and our prices be protected. The international position of the dollar, which means our ability to do what we need to do beyond our borders, demands that our prices and our costs not rise. We must not choke off our needed and speedy economic expansion by a revival of the price-wage spiral. Avoiding that spiral is the responsibility of business, and it is also the responsibility of labor.

The President further said:

I speak as President of the United States, with a single voice to both management and to labor, to the men on both sides of the bargaining table, when I say that your sense of responsibility, the sense of responsibility of organized labor and management, is the foundation upon which our hopes rest in the coming great years.

I take these words of the President at their full value. I take it for granted that, except for the threats to our international security at the present time, there is no problem of greater vitality than to stop any forces that might lead to inflation.

I wish to quote one of the high authorities of our Government, who is supposed to be an expert on this subject. He is Mr. Heller, the President's adviser on economics. In Detroit, Mich., on March 23, 1964, Mr. Heller spoke about the great growth in our economy, and then warned about the dangers that will come unless we guard against inflationary forces.

He said:

Three years have added $100 billion and then some to our annual rate of output. Full shares have been dealt to both business and labor—more than $16 billion of added profits and some $55 billion of added labor income, at annual rates. At the same time, the consumer was benefiting from a more stable price level in the United States than in any other advanced country in the world.

Mr. Heller further said:

It is hard, then, to dim the lustre of the current profits performance. What makes the rise in profits—and cash flow—particularly gratifying is that it is being achieved in a setting of essential price stability; wage-rate increases that are roughly keeping pace with productivity advances; and briskly rising total labor earnings.

No better setting has existed in the entire postwar period for a price-wage-dividend policy which will achieve fair shares, simultaneously, for the consumer, the wage-earner, and the stockholder.

It will be noted in the statements which I have quoted, that the consumer is mentioned intermittently. That is a very significant aspect of these statements. We have more than the interest of the manufacturer, the industrialist, and the worker. We have the interest of the large number of consumers in our country who form an important segment of our society and economy. Unless they are protected, we may find ourselves in a position where the labor leaders will be demanding inordinate wage increases. The manufacturer has received his profit, but all at the expense of the consumer. In my judgment, this is contrary to the interest and the security of our Nation.

Mr. Heller then continues:

What could destroy this balance? Either the resumption of inflation or the ballooning of costs, or the interlocking of the two in a renewed price-wage spiral. Whether the economic promise of the mid-1960's is endangered by these forces is my final point of inquiry today.

Mr. Heller states:

In today's vigorously expanding economy, it would be less than prudent not to keep an eye cocked on the price-wage front. Past prosperities have often generated upward pressures on the price level—and our responses to the "problem of inflation" tend

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

to be governed, not surprisingly, by past experience.

We face 1964–65 against a background of several years of stability in prices and unit-labor costs.

Two other important factors enter to satisfy the continuing desire for higher incomes and profits without excessive wage increases and without higher price levels:

First, the good productivity growth record of recent years—3.2 percent currently, compared with 2.8 percent during the 1955–57 period.

Second, the tax cut, which provides a significant continuing bonus in take-home pay and net profits. Its addition of 5 to 10 cents in workers' hourly take-home pay in 1964 compares with a 1963 median wage increase of 9 cents an hour (in "major collective bargaining situations"). And its sizable boost to profits has already been noted.

But responsible public policy must also recognize the possibility that stronger markets will whet the appetite for higher prices—and higher profits will whet the appetites for higher wages—in a strongly advancing economy. Even in the face of greatly improved public understanding of the relation between wages and costs, between costs and prices, between prices and the balance of payments, the temptations of the market will not disappear.

It is against this background that the administration has underscored the importance of the price-wage guideposts—the standards for noninflationary wage and price behavior which expresses the public interest—in wage settlements that stay within the bounds of productivity advances; in price decisions that are consistent with overall stability of the price level.

It is on this premise that I rise today to make an appeal that Congress not pass the Federal pay raise bill. It is our responsibility to set the example for the Nation in the fight to stop inflation. If we pass an extravagant wage increase, nothing but chaos and havoc can be the consequence.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It has been suggested that we will also be asked to reduce taxes further. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding that some statement has been made that we will reduce taxes further. Frankly, I cannot understand how these things can be done without ultimately endangering the very existence of our economic structure and our system of government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The newspaper reports are to the effect that the House Ways and Means Committee plans to start immediately to study the problem of doing away with excise taxes. I agree with the Senator. I do not see how we can continue to reduce our revenues and increase the cost of Government, and maintain any fiscal stability. I agree with the Senator that if we get a big raise in salary at this time, it will be rather difficult to tell the labor unions not to insist on an increase in wages, and it will be rather difficult to ask management not to grant it. We set the example, as the Senator said.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur entirely with what the Senator from Arkansas said, that we cannot continually spend more than we take in without going into bankruptcy. The management of government is no different that the management of a home. The home that spends each year more than they take in is destined for an accounting and for an atonement. And it is usually a very painful one.

There was once the philosophy that we ought to tax in an amount equal to the amount necessary to run government. That philosophy was thrown overboard. A new one was adopted that provided: "Tax and tax, and spend and spend."

We now have the philosophy: "Spend more; tax less; and everyone will be in better shape."

We may be in better shape for a brief period, perhaps for a year. But the time to answer for those misdeeds is sure to arrive.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There are those with tremendous influence in government today, who advocate what they call active deficits as a way of life for government. In other words, they advocate that we should continually spend more and more, and thus keep a stimulated economy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The economic adviser whose name I mentioned, Mr. Heller, somewhere made the statement that the bureaucratic hue on public spending must be dismissed and abandoned.

Mr. McCLELLAN. By that Mr. Heller means keeping a balanced budget and living within our income. That is what he means by "puritanical view."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. He sort of condemned what is known as the "puritanical" approach to the operation of Government. Whether he meant what he said, I do not know. He said that morality in the management of the fiscal affairs of the Government is an antiquated concept and should be discarded. I cannot agree with that statement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. He implied that it is an obsolete standard of ethics and morality.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. That is what he advocated.

Mr. President, today's issue of the Washington Post reports that the guidelines which were set down by the President and the Economic Advisory Committee, advocated by Mr. Heller, are being abandoned in the wage negotiations in Detroit. Those guidelines will not be maintained. Instead, they will be violated.

In Cleveland there is a strike of building-trades men. A concession of a 75-cent-an-hour increase in wages was made to 11 unions, I believe. They accepted the increase. The 75-cent-an-hour increase is an amount in excess of what the guidelines of the President and the Advisory Committee reported. Six or seven other trade unions refused to accept that 75-cent package and are asking for something more than a dollar. That action is in violation of the guidelines set down.

I now come to the principal aspect of my discussion. Is it proper and advisable for the Congress to pass a pay bill which would grant to Congressmen a pay raise of $7,500 a year, raising the salary from $22,500 to $30,000?

Other high public officials would be granted similar increases. The pay raise contemplated for Congressmen would be a 33⅓ percent increase. In 1955 the salary of Congressmen was raised from $12,500 a year to $22,500. That increase was practically a 100-percent pay raise.

The salary of the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court was raised from $25,500 to $35,500 in 1955. The salaries of the Associate Justices were increased from $25,000 to $35,000 a year. The salaries of Cabinet officers were raised from $22,500 to $25,000 in 1956.

I shall not attempt to state the proposed salary increases for all public officials, but the bill would give a liberal and, in my opinion, an unjustified salary increase to members of boards, members of commissions, Members of Congress, members of the courts and others whom I cannot immediately identify.

As a Congressman, if I should now retire while my salary is $22,500 a year, I would be entitled to a pension of 2½ percent for each year of service. I have been in the Senate for 8 years, so I would be entitled to 20 percent of $22,500 as a pension.

If the proposed pay raise is granted, and I should continue to serve another 5 years in the Senate, my pension would be calculated at the $30,000 level, which is proposed, instead of the $22,500 present level. If I remained in the Senate an additional 5 years, my total service would be 13 years, and I would receive a pension calculated at 13 times 2½ percent—which would be 32½ percent—of $30,000, instead of $22,500.

As Senators know, we are granted a $3,000 expemption on our income taxes. In other words, $3,000 of our income is not taxed.

We are granted a stationery allowance of $1,800, and whatever portion of that amount we do not spend, we are allowed to retain.

During each session of Congress we are granted two trips to and from our homes with reimbursement. We are allowed $100 a month to maintain an office at home, even though that office may be connected with the law office that a Congressman may be running.

We are allowed to practice law or to engage in business. I concede that there is not much time to do so, but the privilege exists.

Finally, I pose the question as to how many Congressmen would quit if we failed to raise their salaries to $30,000. As I said once before, they could not be driven out with a shotgun.

Yet the argument is made that unless salaries are raised, good men will not run for the office. The raising of salaries will have no impact whatsoever on the quality of men who are willing to serve. The

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

same caliber of men will be running. For every position that is available there will be 100 candidates.

I should like to refer again to the salaries of Federal judges. As I have said, the salary of a Justice of the Supreme Court is $35,500. The salary of a district court judge is $22,500. But what about their pensions? They pay nothing into the pension fund. We pay 6½ percent of our salary. A Federal judge at the age of 70 years, with 10 years of service, can retire and receive full pay for the rest of his life. A Federal judge at the age of 65 with 15 years of service, without having paid anything into the pension fund, can go on the inactive list, as they call it, and receive full pay each year.

The U.S. Supreme Court Judges receive $35,000 a year. The U.S. district judges receive $22,500 a year.

Can someone argue that judges cannot be obtained to go on the Federal bench? I ask Senate colleagues, How many applicants do they receive for each Federal judgeship that is vacant? Have you ever heard of a lawyer that would decline to accept a judgeship? I have not. I have had 20 years of experience in high office, and I know that the applicants have been innumerable and endless in asking my intervention to receive appointments to Federal judgeships.

Are we going to be able to turn down inordinate demands of others when we become most liberal in granting to ourselves the taxpayers' money? I think the administration and the Congress will be absolutely defenseless.

When I argue in favor of stability in prices and wages, how will I be able to do so in the future, if I vote for the 33⅓-percent increase, when the guidelines of the President call for no further increase than 3.2 percent? I simply will not be able to do so if I render myself defenseless by this act.

I want to direct my attention now for a moment to the situation that prevails in the State governments. It is argued that we must raise the salaries of Federal employees. I ask my colleagues to listen particularly to some information which, in my opinion, will be startling to them.

On the basis of reports made in October 1962, the average weekly earnings of full-time State employees, except those in education, was $91 a week. For the same period in 1962, the average Federal employee's wage was $113.

Throughout the country the average weekly compensation of State employees is $91, and the average weekly compensation for Federal employees is $113.

In Ohio, the average State employee's salary is $86. Ohio must compete with salaries and wages paid Federal employees, who in Ohio are now earning $117 a week. In Ohio the average pay of the Federal employee is $117 a week, as against $86 a week for the Ohio State employees.

This is true not only of Ohio but of practically all the States in the Nation.

I observe present on the floor from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I am looking to see if I can find the situation which prevails in his State.

The average weekly earnings in Arkansas are $65.62——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is that for the State government?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The State government. The average weekly earnings of Federal employees in Arkansas is $97.58 a week. So there is a difference of $32 a week.

What is the problem that arises? The Federal Government is pirating from the State of Arkansas its employees. It is also being done in Ohio.

I see also present on the floor the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. I am taking a look to see what the situation is that prevails in his State with respect to wages paid by the Federal Government and by the State government.

In Indiana the average State employee's wage is $79.94. The average Federal employee working in Indiana receives $105.02 a week.

If one examines the salaries of judges in the States, of prosecuting attorneys, of cabinet members, of Governors, he finds practically the same disparity to prevail. Yet this liberal Congress—and it is most liberal in taking the taxpayer's money and giving it away—instead of solving the problem is going to make it more difficult all the time.

No, I will not support the pay raise bill that is before Congress. I will not do so because I feel the Congress of the United States should set the example for States, industry, and labor leaders to guard against the menace of inflation. If the menace materializes, Mr. President, there will be agonizing cries throughout the country. People with annuities, with pensions, with Government bonds, with fixed income, with deposits in the bank placed there as nest eggs for old age, will find themselves robbed of their thrift and savings through a lifetime.

Inflation will eat away their money, and eat it away rapidly. These are not my words. They are deducible from what the President of the United States has said, what the Economic Advisory Committee has said, what Mr. Heller has said about the need of guarding against pentup inflationary forces.

Why did I run for the office of mayor, Governor, and Senator? Was it because of the pay, or was it because I wanted the dignity, the honor, and the ability to serve my fellow men? I would venture to say that, so far as the $22,500 salary is concerned, if we made a tabulation of the 535 Members of the House and of the Senate, it would be found that $22,500 exceeded the income most of them had in private practice or whatever occupations they were in.

If we have reached the stage that people will not serve their Government except through the inducement of extravagant pay, our country is in trouble. That was not the psychology which dominated the founders of our country. Public service was considered an honor. They wished to give it for the purpose of establishing our system of government and serving their fellow men.

I wish we could make a test of it and say to Members of Congress, "Those of you who do not feel you are being paid enough, quit." How many would quit?

Finally, Mr. President, I campaigned for reelection in 1962. Did I say to the people of Ohio at that time, "I am not being paid enough. My salary should be increased to $32,500 or at least to $30,000"? I did not say it and I am sure that if I had I would not now be in the Senate.

I wonder whether there is any one of the 535 Members of the Senate and House who, when he was begging for reelection from the people of his State, said to them, "If you will elect me I shall go to Congress and while there will vote myself this pay increase."

No one said it and I am sure that if he did he likewise would now be without a post in this Congress.

The object was to get elected.

The bill may be enacted, but it will not be enacted as a result of my vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks certain tables from which I gave statistical information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average weekly earnings of full-time State employees, except in education, October 1962

Rank and State	Full-time State employees	Average weekly earnings
All States	1,068,715	$91.42
1. Alaska	3,129	147.38
2. California	93,619	124.69
3. Hawaii	5,924	114.38
4. Nevada	2,705	111.60
5. Michigan	34,315	109.71
6. New York	109,104	104.94
7. Washington	20,468	101.68
8. Wisconsin	16,972	101.48
9. Oregon	15,863	99.54
10. Illinois	44,654	98.85
11. Colorado	11,741	98.36
12. Utah	5,803	97.16
13. Connecticut	20,352	96.07
14. Arizona	8,313	96.03
15. Vermont	3,917	95.79
16. Montana	5,925	95.72
17. Minnesota	19,078	94.67
18. Wyoming	3,355	94.15
19. Massachusetts	37,710	93.13
20. New Jersey	28,670	92.99
21. Idaho	5,392	91.50
22. New Hampshire	5,191	89.46
23. New Mexico	6,799	88.64
24. Iowa	16,532	88.13
25. Pennsylvania	77,405	87.63
26. Rhode Island	7,399	86.68
27. Ohio	46,838	86.56
28. Maryland	20,100	86.30
29. North Dakota	4,511	85.55
30. North Carolina	28,555	85.36
31. Kansas	14,223	84.90
32. South Dakota	4,986	84.90
33. Maine	8,997	82.69
34. Kentucky	19,385	80.91
35. Indiana	23,126	79.74
36. Georgia	20,435	79.44
37. Missouri	23,757	79.06
38. Virginia	30,470	77.71
39. Nebraska	9,717	76.59
40. Texas	46,862	76.50
41. Florida	30,989	75.19
42. Alabama	17,229	75.16
43. Louisiana	31,197	74.59
44. Delaware	4,886	73.86
45. South Carolina	15,003	73.00
46. Oklahoma	16,520	72.72
47. West Virginia	15,598	68.64
48. Mississippi	12,638	67.99
49. Arkansas	11,767	65.42
50. Tennessee	20,605	65.08

Source: Bureau of the Census, "State Distribution of Public Employment in 1962," April 1963; Washington, D.C. Computed from October 1962 full-time equivalent employment and total payroll, for functions other than education.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Average weekly earnings of Federal employees covered by unemployment compensation, 1962

Rank and State	Average Federal employees	Average weekly earnings
All States	2,504,131	$113.29
1. District of Columbia	212,830	136.32
2. Alaska	14,796	135.22
3. Alabama	67,684	121.11
4. California	266,249	118.57
5. Maryland	77,436	117.97
6. Ohio	95,740	117.12
7. Hawaii	27,771	116.36
8. Oregon	22,724	116.04
9. New Jersey	59,783	115.99
10. New Hampshire	13,934	115.80
11. Pennsylvania	136,036	114.93
12. Utah	30,237	113.87
13. Tennessee	39,533	113.35
14. New York	185,735	113.07
15. Florida	55,880	112.83
16. Washington	52,416	112.82
17. Massachusetts	68,196	112.72
18. Colorado	39,097	112.37
19. Virginia	87,809	112.05
20. New Mexico	26,044	111.98
21. Michigan	48,105	110.72
22. Connecticut	16,113	110.58
23. Nevada	7,216	109.82
24. Arizona	22,806	109.47
25. Rhode Island	13,695	109.21
26. Oklahoma	47,220	108.69
27. Missouri	56,048	108.62
28. Wyoming	6,023	108.49
29. Delaware	4,204	108.11
30. Illinois	106,954	107.92
31. Montana	11,528	107.31
32. Louisiana	26,249	107.05
33. Texas	129,770	106.15
34. Georgia	65,545	105.79
35. Indiana	35,776	105.02
36. Vermont	3,522	104.84
37. Minnesota	28,015	104.33
38. Idaho	9,053	103.80
39. Kentucky	32,884	103.65
40. Wisconsin	23,092	102.65
41. South Carolina	28,141	102.37
42. West Virginia	11,699	102.18
43. Mississippi	19,465	101.82
44. Nebraska	19,402	99.41
45. Kansas	25,091	98.66
46. Arkansas	16,630	97.58
47. Maine	9,243	97.34
48. Iowa	20,825	97.15
49. North Dakota	8,504	96.38
50. South Dakota	11,364	95.83
51. North Carolina	37,007	93.17
52. Virgin Islands	14,210	91.19
53. Puerto Rico	9,302	87.62

Source: U.S. Bureau of Employment Security, from tabulations of State agencies.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

McNAMARA'S WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reply to President Johnson's message to Congress on South Vietnam.

I wish to reply, first, by stating that I completely disagree with his proposal, and to say most respectfully that the President should be seeking to send to the Congress, instead, a proposal for declaration of war. The President of the United States should not be sending to the Congress a subterfuge proposal, a policy of intention, a policy of carrying on a war by Executive action rather than congressional action.

That is my major reason for any complete opposition to the proposal of the administration to continue the conduct of an unconstitutional war in South Vietnam, and to the proposal of the administration to continue to kill American boys unjustifiably in an unauthorized war in South Vietnam.

For what purpose, Mr. President?

I repeat, for what purpose?

The need for additional funds to prop up the Khanh government in South Vietnam is only one of many such requests that will be made so long as we continue our fruitless and fatal policy in that country. It is as fruitless and fatal as were the French wars in Indochina and Algeria, and will come to the same end.

We are already financing the Khanh government at the rate of some $550 million a year. This additional money would raise the figure to $675 million. That is more than $49 a year for every person in South Vietnam, and it is exclusive of the cost of our own large military force there.

The effort to keep a "front" government in power is costing the American people well over a billion dollars a year.

Mr. President, we have already poured into that sink-hole over $5½ billion, including $1¼ billion to $1½ billion that we gave to France before its defeat at Dien Bien Phu. All we are doing is picking up the great mistakes of France, Great Britain, the Dutch, and the Belgians in Asia.

It is colonial, no matter what it may be called. Colonialism in the world is as dead as a dodo. American colonialism has no possible chance to succeed, either. This is American colonial policy, and I do not care what semantics the President of the United States uses to describe it.

Despite that huge expenditure, the policy that requires it has not been either explained or justified to the American people.

The President's message stating that more money is needed should be read alongside the report of Robert Moore in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, in which he said:

> Never before have so many Vietnamese officers and public officials lived so well in such a booming economy, injected as it is with a daily dose of almost $2 million of American money. It is obvious to the Vietnamese who are benefiting from this dole that when the war is over this massive aid will cease, or at least be drastically modified.

The request for more money should be read in light of Moore's additional report that the war effort of South Vietnam is characterized by a lack of will to endure privation on the part of its officers, the selection of officers and commanders for political reasons, the expenditure of U.S. money on luxury living, and by graft and corruption from the huge American aid program.

It is corruption, tyranny, and a willingness to live off the American taxpayer that are defeating the Khanh government as much as anything.

If the administration expects anyone to believe we are supporting freedom in South Vietnam, it should be doing something to bring about the free elections throughout all of Vietnam that were supposed to be held 8 years ago.

I am greatly disappointed that my President in his message to Congress seeks to rationalize and to justify his request for this additional support to Vietnam in the name of freedom.

What freedom exists in South Vietnam?

Where is the freedom in South Vietnam?

We are supporting a totalitarian, military, tyrannical, puppet government in South Vietnam. If anyone believes that the South Vietnam people are free, they could not be more wrong.

I should be glad to support the exportation to South Vietnam and elsewhere in the world of the sinews of economic freedom, but I am not going to support tyranny. I am not going to vote in the Senate to kill American boys to support tyranny in South Vietnam—or anywhere else in the world.

I regret that the administration is not urging free elections in South Vietnam.

Oh, there was some nonsense published in the papers the other day about how there will be an election in South Vietnam.

On the floor of the Senate, I state, "Tell the American what kind of election it would be."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. It will be a Russian type election. That is the kind of election they will have. It will be the kind of election Diem had, giving the people a list of candidates on which there is only one way to vote, and saying to them, "You vote for them."

Free elections in South Vietnam? They do not have the slightest comprehension of what political freedom means.

I disagree with the President's message. It seeks to leave the impression with the American people that we are supporting freedom in South Vietnam. We are supporting tyranny. We are supporting a military tyrant.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I stated on the floor of the Senate a while ago when he branded me a traitor that this little tinhorn military tyrant in South Vietnam—this General Khanh—is a despot. The United States is strengthening the arm of a tyrant in South Vietnam. Before I go any further, I wish to warn the American people from the floor of the Senate this afternoon, that I am satisfied the plan is on the way eventually to escalate this war into North Vietnam. Of course, we have the clear obligation under the United Nations treaty to take it to the United Nations and not to commit an act of aggression. We have already been caught committing an act of aggression against Cambodia, and the Prince of Cambodia kicked us out. That ended for all time the fallacious domino theory of John Foster Dulles. Cambodia and Burma have left us, and we all know that, except for South Vietnam and Thailand, there is nothing left to the domino theory of John Foster Dulles.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. When was that promise or suggestion of free elections made? Was it about the time that we were told we would have all of our troops home next year?

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. MORSE. This was in the last 3 weeks. But they will not be free elections. Those are interesting semantics being used. They said there were going to be elections. From that terminology, the American people would believe that those would be free elections of course. But they are not free elections, they are not free elections over there. It is the Russian type of election which one gets in that part of the world.

No, the sad thing is that my Government should be taking this issue to the United Nations now, and not be talking about a President's message which seeks to beef up the unilateral, military American action in South Vietnam and lead to the probability of escalating the war into North Vietnam.

I hate the Government of North Vietnam. I hate all Communist governments. But, Madam President, I recognize the unanswerable truth in international law that Communist governments have the same right of international sovereignty that a free government has. North Vietnam has the same right of sovereignty which the United States has, and if the United States becomes a party to escalating the war into North Vietnam, then the United States stands convicted of aggression. On the other hand, if we believe North Vietnam has committed aggression, the only legal recourse of the United States is to go to the United Nations with our complaint.

Until we do, we are violating our signature to the United Nations Charter. Before I complete these remarks I shall read the letter I sent to Adlai Stevenson, and the letter I sent to Mr. U Thant, asking when action will be taken within the United Nations in connection with the United States unilateral military action in South Vietnam, which I consider to be completely and totally illegal and without the slightest justification in international law. Senators will note that there is not a word in the President's message which justifies our course of action in South Vietnam on the basis of any international right. We have done it unilaterally; that is all. We are proceeding on our own. Yet we profess that we seek to preserve peace in the world. The sad fact is that in Southeast Asia the United States is a threat to the peace of the world.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the Senator from Oregon fear that we will also be involved in Laos, which now seems to be in the throes of a political upheaval?

Mr. MORSE. There is that great danger. As I said in my letter to Mr. U Thant, I believe there is the great danger of our starting another Korea. If that is so, Senators know what the casualties will be. If we start a war against North Vietnam—and I must repeat this on the floor several times, as I have in the last several weeks repeated it several times—the great danger is that the United States will use nuclear weapons, to the everlasting shame of the United States.

If we start to use nuclear weapons in South Vietnam, we shall increase the probabilities of starting a nuclear holocaust. I am greatly concerned about this. Let us look at the position in which we are putting Mr. Khrushchev. I believe he has designs to follow courses of action which amount also to forms of aggression.

The Senator from Alaska made a very brilliant speech last week on the floor of the Senate, on which I have already commented, in regard to the alinement which is being developed between Khrushchev and Nasser. The clear implication is that we may be confronted with a threat to the peace of the world, first in the Middle East, and then in the other part of the world.

When that develops, shall we go to the United Nations and say, "Mr. U Thant, you must do something about Khrushchev in the Middle East." Can we not hear Mr. Khrushchev say, "Look at who is talking. It is the United States. What about your action in South Vietnam?"

This is a two-way street in international law, Madam President.

I wish my Government to return to its pledge under the United Nations Charter. I want my Government to make perfectly clear that we want peace in South Vietnam. There is all the difference in the world between a peacekeeping corps through the United Nations in South Vietnam and making war. Pursuing peace is one thing. Prosecuting a war is another.

The sad fact is that the United States is aiding in the prosecution of war in South Vietnam. American boys are dying. It is uncalled for. There is bound to be, in the weeks ahead, a great debate across this Republic, because the American people, in my judgment, must exercise the final say as to whether the United States is to make war in South Vietnam. We have a glorious opportunity to put into application our pledge to the United Nations and, incidentally, to put Russia on the spot.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. If our justification for beefing up our war in South Vietnam is that there is a danger of a Communist takeover, will we not be told that we must do the same thing in neighboring Laos?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. GRUENING. Then we will be taking on all of southeast Asia.

Mr. MORSE. We will be at war on a full scale.

Mr. GRUENING. We are at war there now, though undeclared.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; if we get into North Vietnam and into Laos, does anyone think Red China will send us bouquets?

Mr. GRUENING. Of course not.

Mr. MORSE. Let us be realistic. We are at a great crossroads in Asia. The great danger is that the United States will go down in history condemned for starting a major conflict in Asia, when what we ought to do is say to the United Nations that we will help the peacekeeping corps.

Before I have concluded my speech I shall point out again—it is necessary to repeat this over and over again—that our alleged allies have walked out on us in southeast Asia. Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand, Great Britain, France, and the Philippines, all signatories to SEATO, have no boys fighting in South Vietnam. The foreign minister of Pakistan said in Washington not so long ago, before the Press Club, that Pakistan has no intention of going into South Vietnam. He did not say he would turn down hundreds of millions of dollars in American military aid and economic aid, so that Pakistan can keep itself in a position of making war, not against Red China, with which Communist country Pakistan has entered into agreements, but against India.

Mr. GRUENING. Which we are also supplying with military aid.

Mr. MORSE. Of course I am opposed to military aid for India. I am opposed to building up two powers in that area of the world who will use military aid to make war against each other over Kashmir.

I say most respectfully that the Pentagon is running the foreign policy of our country more than the State Department is running it.

I do not intend to substitute military policy for foreign policy as the posture that the United States will take before the world in the field of foreign policy.

It is not pleasant to stand on the floor of the Senate in such complete disagreement with the policy of my Government. However, that happens to be my trust. I intend to live up to my trust. As one who swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States, I do not intend to support my Government in a policy which I consider to be unconstitutional. Until the President of the United States gets a declaration of war passed by Congress, in my judgment he is acting outside the framework of the Constitution in asking for this escalation of the war in South Vietnam.

I very much regret that the administration has fallen prey to what the late Senator McMahon used to call the "checkbook reflex" in foreign affairs. It holds that money will buy anything. In this case it assumes that any policy can be made to succeed if only enough money is spent on it. But I predict that three times more than $675 million a year will not keep an American puppet in power in South Vietnam. What the Congress and the American people desperately need is not a request for more money, and not an inquiry into the American military equipment being used. What is needed is a thorough inquiry into the objectives of this money and military expedition, and an inquiry into the policy that necessitates them, for the present policy in South Vietnam will always necessitate more American money and more American military forces.

If we were to go through with this program, we would bog ourselves down in Southeast Asia for a minimum of the next 25 years. In fact, Great Britain, France, and the Dutch know what it means to be bogged down in Asia. But their people, at long last, made it clear to their governments that they should get out. I say to my government: Once

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

portions of his letters to her. In a letter to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, she expressed the hope "that all Americans would have an opportunity to read them."

Spruill was killed April 21.

"Above all, this is a war of mind and spirit," he wrote. "For us to despair would be a great victory for the enemy.

"At the moment my heart is big enough to sustain those around me. Please don't let them back where you are sell me down the river with talk of despair and defeat. There is no backing out of Vietnam, for it will follow us everywhere we go.

"We have drawn the line here, and the America we all know and love best is not one to back away."

Following are other excerpts from his letters, published by the Herald Tribune:

"It was brought to my attention last night that we were once inadequately equipped and poorly trained and that professional soldiers came from afar to aid the fledgling American Army in its fight for freedom and internal order.

"Two of these 'advisers' are well known—Von Steuben and Lafayette. It is heart warming to think that we continue their tradition of sacrifice.

"There are many moments of frustration in Vietnam. Ineptness, dishonesty, lack of spirit, confusion, and laziness cause them. But that is exactly why we are here. It is exactly in places and in circumstances such as this that communism gains its foothold.

"I know that you read nowadays of defeat or of lack of progress. None of this bothers me because I am convinced that we can win it and win it decisively—on the ground and in the night.

"I have a project. It is a proposal to train * * * men in night combat and that they be employed as a mobile strike force at night. It is in the night that the myth of the invincible guerrilla must be destroyed. The people are afraid then. I can feel it. When the night becomes more ours than theirs, events will take a dramatic turn.

"To continue to fight in the day is foolish, for the day is ours for all intents and purposes. It is in the night that they are strong and it is in the night that their back can and must be broken. Choppers (helicopters) do not and cannot fight at night, but soldiers can and will, and it is soldiers who will win this war, not choppers.

"I still maintain that we can beat them in a year or less if we fight them at night and maintain constant pressure on them at night. Little emphasis is given this aspect."

INTERNATIONAL RECIPROCITY FOR AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 720 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 920) to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may issue authorizations, but not licenses, for alien amateur radio operators to operate their amateur radio stations in the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Peurto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation by United States amateurs on a reciprocal basis. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 720 provides for the consideration of S. 920, a bill to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The passage of S. 920 would permit the United States to enter into reciprocal agreements with foreign countries whereby U.S. amateur radio operators may receive authority to operate their amateur radio stations in those foreign countries in return for the United States granting similar privileges to amateur radio operators of those nations while in the United States. The Communications Act of 1934 in sections 303 and 310 embodied congressional policy against granting such authority to aliens. However, it now seems that it would be best to grant such authority on a reciprocal basis in order to keep better track of such stations and operators in this country. Therefore, in order to enter into such agreements it would be necessary to amend the act, particularly those sections referred to above. As the contents of the bill will be fully explained to general debate I will not go into greater detail here.

Mr. Speaker, I favor and urge the adoption of House Resolution 720.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side and there is no opposition to the rule that I know of, and now yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] 30 minutes and reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill, S. 920. As has already been stated, this bill comes from the committee without any opposition and I, for one, know of no opposition to the rule. There has been a question in some people's minds as to the safety to our own country from allowing these radio operators to operate here. But I understand from the report and from reading the letter from Mr. Katzenbach, Deputy Attorney General, that he feels any danger that might have been in the original bill has been eliminated in this one and that the proper precautions have been taken.

On page 9 of the report, there are some things that I think we ought to consider at least and see what the objections originally were.

It says:

1. While reciprocal agreements—presumably entered into with the more friendly nations—might mitigate security problems, consideration of national security would remain in individual cases especially since we are here dealing with aliens rather than our own citizens.

2. Congress—if it enacts such legislation should assure itself that appropriate security measures will be undertaken by such agencies as it specifies.

3. The Commission has no expertise or staff to handle security investigations and security determinations should not be made by the FCC.

4. While the Commission would prefer simply to refer the names of those requesting such authority to an appropriate security agency and have that agency tell us whenever a request should be denied on security grounds, we are willing—should Congress so desire—to check with whatever security agencies Congress deems appropriate—and to receive information and/or recommendation from such agencies bearing on the security issue.

This I gather has been satisfied and the bill, the purpose of which is to permit the United States to enter into reciprocal agreements whereby U.S. amateur radio operators may receive authority to operate their amateur radio stations in foreign countries in return for granting amateur operators of those countries similar privileges in the United States, and the conclusion reached is that the committee believes that with the security safeguards written into this legislation which is now before us, enactment of this legislation is in the national interest.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, and I have no requests for time, I believe it is almost unanimous that the rule should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL RECIPROCITY FOR AMATEUR RADIO OPERATORS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 920) to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may issue authorizations, but not licenses, for alien amateur radio operators to operate their amateur radio stations in the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation by U.S. amateurs on a reciprocal basis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 920, with Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in the chair.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. Bob Wilson of California and Mr. Rhodes of Arizona for, with Mr. Bray against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Garmatz with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Schenck.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Corman with Mrs. May.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. McLoskey.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. MacDonald with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Bruce.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. McDade.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. McCIory.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Ashmore with Mrs. Baker.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Montoya.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Forrester.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Lankford with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Edwards.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Stubblefield.
Mr. Bass with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Huddleston with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Staebler.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Price with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Karth with Mrs. Kelly.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. St Germain.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF NAVAL AIR STATION, PENSACOLA, FLA.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 889.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the city of Pensacola proposes to celebrate with appropriate ceremonies the golden anniversary of the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, on June 13, 1964; and

Whereas, while there was limited naval aviation activity prior to the establishment of a school for training of naval aviators at Pensacola, the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, is regarded as the first home for naval aviators; and

Whereas the training programs of the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, have significantly contributed to the defense of the United States and, through its training programs for friendly governments, has contributed to the defense of the free world; and

Whereas a celebration of the character planned will contribute greatly to the educational and cultural welfare and to the defense of the people of the United States by highlighting the great traditions of naval aviation which have been handed down through the years and which must be kept intact in today's troubled world; and

Whereas appropriate recognition is taken of the contributions, the interest, and the warm friendship shown by the people of Pensacola and Escambia County through these fifty years for the personnel of the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States recognizes with appreciation the significance of these events toward maintaining world peace through strength of naval aviation and through the greatness of the hearts of the Navy men who have given naval aviation that strength: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to design and manufacture, and to accept payment therefor from private sources, a galvano of appropriate design commemorating the golden anniversary of the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida. The payment of such cost, if any, to the Government shall be reimbursed to the appropriation of the Bureau of the Mint, by the Fiesta of Five Flags and Naval Aviators Homecoming Celebration, 330 Brent Building, Pensacola, Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The question is on suspending the rules and passing the House joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the House joint resolution was passed.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 889 is a joint resolution by which the Congress will commemorate the golden anniversary of the naval air station at Pensacola. It authorizes the design and manufacture of a galvano or medallion in commemoration of this significant event. There would be no cost to the Government for the design and manufacture of this galvano since local interests would defray the expense.

It is planned that the galvano will be presented in Pensacola on June 13 during the celebration of the "Fiesta of Five Flags," an annual pageant commemorating the founding and early history of Pensacola.

The fact that the galvano is to be presented on June 13 explains the reason the resolution is being brought to the House under suspension of the rules. Delays have been encountered in getting the bill to the floor, and it is important that the matter now be expedited. I am very appreciative for the help of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and particularly of that given by the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri, Mrs. LEONOR SULLIVAN.

On January 20, 1914, the U.S.S. *Mississippi* steamed into Pensacola Bay with the whole of naval aviation aboard. It comprised 7 aviators, 23 enlisted men, and 7 aircraft. Upon arrival at the old Pensacola Naval Yard—located at the site of a naval shipyard founded in 1837—they established the first U.S. naval aeronautical station.

Now, 50 years later, the Navy's air arm includes 24,853 officers and 196,169 enlisted men, exclusive of the Marine Corps air arm which encompasses 6,404 officers and 40,165 enlisted men. There are now 71 naval air bases worldwide and 12 reserve bases, and 6,976 aircraft. This is a far cry, indeed, from the tiny beginning on the shores of Pensacola Bay 50 years ago.

I consider it highly appropriate that the Congress join in commemorating the work of the naval air station at Pensacola and its contributions to the defense of the United States.

JAMES P. SPRUILL

(Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include an article appearing in the Washington Post.)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, in 1950, I had the privilege of appointing James P. Spruill, of Plymouth, N.C., to West Point. Mr. Spruill was a fine, intelligent, and popular young man in his community. He did well at the Academy.

It is with the deepest regret that I read in today's paper of his death in Vietnam a month ago while serving his country in an effort to assist that small, beleagured nation.

The story appearing in the Washington Post of Monday, May 18, includes excerpts from Captain Spruill's letters to his wife. They are worth reading for they reassure all Americans of the selfless dedication of our military men to the cause of liberty. His confidence in the ultimate victory in South Vietnam should give us confidence. The thoughtfulness revealed in his suggestions for the improvement of guerrilla warfare shows the highest type of imagination and initiative.

In their sorrow, Captain Spruill's mother, wife, and bereaved family may take some proud comfort from his sacrifice to the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include this news story.

WIDOW SAYS U.S. CAPTAIN URGED VIET NIGHT FIGHTING

NEW YORK, May 17.—An American Army captain, killed in Vietnam a month ago, wrote to his wife that "we must stand strong and give heart to an embattled and confused people. This cannot be done if America loses heart."

Barbara A. Spruill, of Suffern, N.Y., widow of Capt. James P. Spruill, made public today

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may wish to do so may revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD following the remarks I shall make.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (1) of section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 303) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(1)"; and

(2) by adding at the end of such subsection the following: "(2) Notwithstanding section 301 of this Act and paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Commission may issue authorizations, under such conditions and terms as it may prescribe, to permit an alien licensed by his government as an amateur radio operator to operate his amateur radio station licensed by his government in the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation on a reciprocal basis by United States amateur radio operators: *Provided,* That when an application for an authorization is received by the Commission, it shall notify the appropriate agencies of the Government of such fact, and such agencies shall forthwith furnish to the Commission such information in their possession as bears upon the compatibility of the request with the national security: *And provided further,* That the requested authorization may then be granted unless the Commission shall determine that information received from such agencies necessitates denial of the request. Other provisions of this Act and of the Administrative Procedure Act shall not be applicable to any request or application for or modification, suspension, or cancellation of any such authorization."

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 310 of the Communication Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding section 301 of this Act and paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection, the Commission may issue authorizations, under such conditions and terms as it may prescribe, to permit an alien licensed by his government as an amateur radio operator to operate his amateur radio station licensed by his government in the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation on a reciprocal basis by United States amateur radio operators: *Provided,* That when an application for an authorization is received by the Commission, it shall notify the appropriate agencies of the Government of such fact, and such agencies shall forthwith furnish to the Commission such information in their possession as bears upon the compatibility of the request with the national security: *And provided further,* That the requested authorization may then be granted unless the Commission shall determine that information received from such agencies necessitates denial of the request. Other provisions of this Act and of the Administrative Procedure Act shall not be applicable to any request or application for or modification, suspension, or cancellation of any such authorization."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 920) to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may issue authorizations, but not licenses, for alien amateur radio operators to operate their amateur radio stations in the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation by U.S. amateurs on a reciprocal basis, pursuant to House Resolution 720, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CONTRACT WITH INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATIONS, INC.

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and to include certain pertinent material.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, our colleague, Representative WESTLAND, placed in the RECORD an item regarding a contract between the Virgin Islands government and Mr. Robert Lodge, doing business as International Publications, Inc. This article was critical of the negotiations between Mr. Henry L. Kimelman, commissioner, Virgin Islands Department of Commerce, and Mr. Lodge relative to Virgin Islands advertising in the Caribbean Pavilion at the New York World's Fair.

In order to present Mr. Kimelman's views on the issue I am including in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a memorandum, dated May 4, 1964, prepared by Mr. Kimelman for the Honorable Ralph M. Paiewonsky, Governor of the Virgin Islands. In his memorandum Mr. Kimelman explains step by step the procedures followed in the preparation and implementation of the contract. Mr. Kimelman's memorandum reads as follows:

MAY 4, 1964.

MEMORANDUM

To: The Honorable Ralph M. Paiewonsky, Governor of the Virgin Islands.

From: Henry L. Kimelman, commissioner of commerce.

Subject: Full facts in connection with Lodge agreement, February 16, 1964, and subsequent controversy.

This is a memorandum in reply to your request for the full facts in connection with the agreement entered into between the Government of the Virgin Islands through its Department of Commerce and Mr. Robert Lodge.

On December 12, 1963, the legislature passed bill No. 1960, which subsequently became act No. 1055. This legislation authorized particpation of the Virgin Islands Government in the Caribbean Pavilion of the New York World's Fair of 1964–65, established a special World's Fair fund and appropriated $25,000 therefor.

Section 2 of this act specifically states: "The commissioner of commerce is authorized to make such arangements concerning the subleasing of space at the exhibit, and the organization of displays, concessions entertainment and similar matters as he believes will further the objectives of the legislature in authorizing Virgin Islands particiipation and will reduce the cost of such participation."

Section 3 of this same act states: "That purchases and contracts for the purpose of operating the Virgin Islands exhibit may be made by the commissioner of commerce without advertising and bids."

With opening date of the New York World's Fair scheduled for April 22, 1964, it was obvious to the legislature and the Governor that time was a vital factor. We proceeded to negotiate with the Caribbean Exposition Corporation, owners of the Caribbean Pavilion and concluded contractual arrangements with them in accordance with act No. 1055 on January 21, 1964, 92 days before the scheduled official opening of the fair.

On that date, our site was barren, indeed snow covered. The Caribbean Pavilion opened 91 days later, a day prior to the official opening of the World's Fair with a luncheon hosted by our department for over 100 leading travel agents, travel press and transportation executives.

The sugar mill, stone walls, and large color photographs comprising our Virgin Islands government exhibit was complete. A ribbon-cutting ceremony was held and a radio broadcast of the opening ceremonies was transmitted to the Virgin Islands. We were ready for business on time and at a location which is by any standard the "Times Square" of the World's Fair grounds, at the corner where the Avenue of the Americas meets the Unisphere.

The advantages of the Virgin Islands' participation in the World's Fair are clear enough. May I quote the comments of the managing editor of the Home Journal on Friday, February 7, 1964:

"I had little or no intention of going to the New York World's Fair but after hearing the persuasive plans of Commerce Commissioner Henry Kimelman concerning the participation of the Virgin Islands in this $1 billion world production I feel that I should go to the fair to help save the honor of the Virgin Islands. Not to do so would be criminal. The Virgin Islands exhibit in the Caribbean Pavilion will be beautiful, functional, and profitable to the Virgin Islands and should be another boost to tourism.

"Virgin Islanders in New York will be proud of this tribute to their native land and Virgin Islanders here at home should run—not walk—to the nearest travel agency to make plans for the trip.

"The fair will be fun, to be sure, but the fair will also mean many millions of dollars in tax revenue from rum sales over the 2 years run of the fair that otherwise would probably take until 1970 to realize from present sources. The fair will also mean a tremendous boost to tourism and local busi-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

nessmen are pitching in to help the cause. Virgin Islanders with vision can prepare for big things as a result of the fair."

In addition to our prime contract with the Caribbean Exposition Corp., we concluded contracts with both rum distillers in the Virgin Islands, with Caribair, the Virgin Islands manufacturer of women's perfume, approximately 30 gift shops, Hertz Rent-A Car, Pivar Real Estate, 10 Virgin Islands hotels, and a concession lease agreement. We also concluded an agreement with Lodge for the printing and distribution of 500,000 copies of a three-island overall promotional piece of literature to supply the requirements of the approximately 8 million people it is estimated will visit the Caribbean Pavilion.

After all of the negotiations and the making of the aforementioned agreements, the construction of our exhibit building, the building of our display installation, etc., the only item that has given rise to controversy is the agreement between the government of the Virgin Islands and Robert Lodge.

In connection with our planned participation in the World's Fair, notices were mailed to all tourist interests, including the press, on December 16, 1963. Public participation was not only solicited, but encouraged and invited. Two public meetings were held in St. Thomas and two in St. Croix. Comments and recommendations were repeatedly asked for. Press releases were issued in connection with advance notices of each of these meetings. Hundreds of form postcards were mailed as well as solicitation by telephone to all of the press, shops, hotels, etc. There is no question that this department did everything in its power to make the World's Fair project a community project and to invite not only participation but any and all suggestions that would help make our Virgin Islands exhibit outstanding.

Specific charges have been directed at me in connection with the Lodge agreement principally from "parties at interest." These are my comments:

STATEMENT

1. "For the record, the entire, long and in my opinion, unethical story began shortly after you had appointed Henry L. Kimelman as Commissioner of Commerce. One of Kimelman's first actions was to appoint Robert Lodge to coordinate a joint advertising campaign encompassing the Virgin Islands government, transportation industries, and individual businessmen dedicated to the tourist industry."

COMMENT

This is an outright falsehood. When this complaint was made in 1961 by this same source I wrote you, on November 3, 1961, as follows: "Lodge was never authorized to represent me personally nor has he any official connection with the department of commerce." I reiterate that Mr. Lodge was never appointed by me for any purpose in any way, shape or form.

STATEMENT

2. On November 26, 1962, Judge Walter A. Gordon of the District Court of the Virgin Islands handed down a judgment of $10,088.65 plus attorneys' fees against Lodge and in favor of the Hearst Corp. for advertising rum in their magazines and not paid for. We felt that this judgment handed down by Judge Gordon would certainly end any connection you, as Governor of the Virgin Islands, or your commissioner of commerce would have in the foreseeable future with Lodge. Not so.

COMMENT

I was not aware until April 30, 1964, a few days ago, that a judgment had been entered by the district court against Mr. Lodge. I became aware on April 2, 1964, from Mr. Harman's "Sammy Glick" letter that Hearst magazines was suing Mr. Lodge. I queried Mr. Lodge about this matter. He advised me that he had a counterclaim against Hearst for nonperformance on their part in connection with his dealings with them. Certainly I would have had no possible reason for suspecting that Lodge might be judgment proof. He lives in a substantial home which I would estimate to be worth $150,000, drives quality cars and appears to be a successful publisher and entrepreneur. Whatever his controversy with Hearst, the government of the Virgin Islands is in no way involved.

STATEMENT

3. "Kimelman says that Lodge is to pay the government of the Virgin Islands $10,000 for the exclusive advertising rights at the World's Fair. It has been said, and not denied, that Kimelman or his agents or employees have contracted with Lodge for a full page of advertising in the name of the government of the Virgin Islands. If this is so, simple mathematics show: Lodge pays government $10,000; government pays Lodge $11,500; net gain for Lodge, $1,500."

COMMENT

Completely inaccurate. The contract with Lodge concluded on February 6, 1964, does not commit the government of the Virgin Islands to purchase any advertising whatsoever, rum, or tourism in the special World's Fair publication Lodge was to produce. During his subsequent solicitation Lodge approached our advertising agency to suggest to them the placement of an advertisement for both tourism and rum. The agency's planning board saw no need whatsoever for tourism advertising in this publication. Our agency recognized properly in my opinion the opportunity for a Virgin Islands rum advertisement in this publication. It should be particularly noted that contract with the Caribbean Pavilion called for exclusive use of Virgin Islands rum at the bar, or bars, in the pavilion during the entire period of the World's Fair. The agency's planning board felt that this medium giving distribution of 5 million pieces of literature to visitors who were being made Virgin Islands rum conscious was an excellent choice for advertising Virgin Islands rum.

In the early days of March the agency telephoned me as chairman of the Virgin Islands Rum Council to obtain my confirmation. I concurred in this advertisement provided there were funds available in the contingent rum advertising account, and provided they had the approval of the other active members of the Rum Council, they could place this advertisement. They received such approval and on March 20, 1964, deputy commissioner and the executive director of the Rum Council in the Department of Commerce approved a half-page, not a 1-page, insertion. This accounted for $5,750 and not $11,500, as stated. Mr. Lodge subsequently reduced the size of his World's Fair publication to half its contemplated size and, consequently, the advertising cost to the government was reduced to half of $5,750 or $2,875. This advertisement order was subsequently canceled on your instructions.

STATEMENT

4. "And with his financial background, who can be sure that Lodge will pay the government $10,000. He still had the more than $10,000 judgment hanging over his head."

COMMENT

See reply under No. 2. The Lodge contract called for a $5,000 payment within 7 days of signing which has been received as per contract and deposited in the special World's Fair account of the government of the Virgin Islands.

STATEMENT

5. "On March 31, the Comptroller of the Virgin Islands, Peter Bove, branded this entire action illegal and added, 'It would appear to be in the best interest of the government to cancel this contract and to take other steps commensurate with the responsibilities involved now.' "

COMMENT

The Attorney General advised both of us at a meeting in your office on April 2, 1964, that I had the legal authority to enter into this agreement with Mr. Lodge. Apparently the comptroller, Mr. Peter Bove was unaware of the provisions in act No. 1055 dispensing with the conditions of advertising and bids in view of the urgent time schedule.

STATEMENT

6. "Lt. Cmdr. Harry Harman III, in his 'Sammy Glick' letter of March 16, quoted in part 'All of us knew, i.e., that Bob Lodge "is a crook," and that no sensible businessman would have any thing to do with him".' "

COMMENT

All one has to do is pick up a current copy of St. Thomas's This Week or St. Croix' This Week and they will see advertised therein such prominent shops as Cavanagh's, the Continental, A. H. Riise, Bolero, Spanish Main, Casa Venegas, Bluebeard's Castle, Virgin Isle Hilton, Buccaneer Hotel, etc., and such famous national and international advertisers as Grants and Teachers Scotch, Seagrams, Omega and Rolex watches, Zeiss and Leica cameras, etc., ad infinitum.

Whereas Lodge has been depicted by competitive interests as a drifter and irresponsible, he is in fact an energetic, effective, and by all appearances the most successful publisher in the Virgin Islands. He publishes This Week publications in other Caribbean islands and I am informed is presently organizing the publication of This Week issues in capital cities in Europe.

It is important to bear in mind that in response to my requests to the entire community to come forward with suggestions for making our World's Fair participation fully effective, it was only Lodge who developed and put forward the idea to produce an overall three-island piece of promotional literature for distribution at the Caribbean Pavilion at the World's Fair. In our negotiations he agreed to provide up to 5 million copies in the quantities as we required them during the 2-year period. I suggested that he offer $10,000 for the exclusive right of distribution, which offer he then made.

As you are aware it was my intention to grant to Lodge the exclusive right of distribution but in the rush of preparing the contract language granted Lodge the exclusive right to publish and not exclusive distribution of said publication. In effect, the word "exclusive" appeared by accident in the wrong place and this escaped both us and Lodge's attorney.

It was my opinion that we had a moral obligation to Lodge to grant him exclusive distribution of his publication.

After consulting the Attorney General, you advised me about February 24 or 25 that you did not consider that Lodge had an exclusive distribution contract. You instructed me to notify Mr. Lodge that his contract was not and would not be made into an exclusive distribution, and I subsequently did so notify Mr. Lodge.

It was then made publicly known that distribution proposals for World's Fair publications would be entertained from others. The only party evidencing any interest prior to the publication of Mr. Peter Bove's press release, which was simultaneously issued upon delivery of his letters to you of March 30 and April 1, was Mr. Ariel Melchoir, the publisher of the Daily News and Virgin Islands magazine.

The Comptroller, Peter Bove, in his letter of March 30, took the position that the contract was illegal and recommended immediate cancellation. The headlines in the local

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

sion, it passed a resolution which was intended to be a reservation to the treaty, if adopted, reaffirming its adherence to the principles of self-determination and its previous vote of sympathy with the aspirations of the Irish people for a government of their own choice, and went further and expressed the earnest hope that once Ireland had got self-government it would be promptly admitted as a member of the League of Nations.

You know that on account of articles in the covenant and circumstances of the day the treaty was not ratified.

But the resolutions here in Congress, supported as they were, and mirroring as they did the attitude of the American people as a whole were made manifest by immense demonstrations in all the principal cities throughout the United States. Recognition was given by the mayors of your principal cities, by the governors and legislatures of many of your States, so that Congress here was expressing accurately the will of the American people in regard to Ireland.

It is not necessary for me to tell you how heartened our people were by these expressions of sympathy and friendship. We were in a very difficult struggle, facing very great odds. And it was a comfort and an earnest of ultimate success that this great freedom-loving nation of America and its people were behind our efforts.

What was the gratitude of the Irish people was clearly evident to anyone who saw the reception that was given to your late President, President Kennedy. He was welcomed not merely because he was of Irish blood, not merely because of his personal charm and his great qualities of heart and mind, nor even because of the great leadership which he was giving to the world in critical moments; but he was honored because he was regarded by our people as the symbol of this great Nation, because he was the elected President of this great people. [Applause.]

In honoring him they felt that they were in some small measure expressing their gratitude to the peope of the United States for the aid that had been given to them.

The United States since the Declaration of Independence has been looked upon by all freedom-loving peoples as the champion of human liberty, the liberty of nations, and the liberty of individuals. We in Ireland have constantly looked to you as such a champion.

We all know that the former League of Nations came into being as the result of American initiative—although, as I said, for reasons which seemed good at the time to the American people they did not ratify the treaty or become members of the League. But the idea came from America, in modern times, anyhow.

And the successor of the League—the United Nations Organization—also came into being as the result of American influence.

Most thinking people will admit that if we are to look forward to peace, to anything like a lasting peace in this world, it can only be secured by the working of such an organization—an organization that will purposely devote itself to bringing about the rule of law and, where other means have failed, judicial determination of international disputes, and enforcement of peace when that becomes necessary. [Applause.]

Now, you all know that we are far from being at that goal at present. But there is no one who has read the speeches of President Kennedy or the speeches of President Johnson or the speeches and statements of your Secretary of State or of the chairman of your Foreign Relations Committee, but must be satisfied that American leaders are thinking at the highest level and that they are facing realistically the complicated situations that confront them and also the social evils that have to be remedied.

It is a great comfort to know that a nation like yours is thinking at that level. And we have the hope that as long as there is thinking at that level and as long as this Nation is guided by the Divine Spirit that ultimately the peace and the conditions which we all wish for will be realized. [Applause.]

But freedom and peace are but the foundations. They are the necessary foundations.

The United States as a great nation and ours as one of the smaller nations, working in our complementary ways, are endeavoring to build, to secure that these foundations will be well laid.

But that is not all, of course. An Irish poet thinking some 120 years ago of the role he would wish his nation to play addressed us in these words:

> Oh, Ireland, be it thy high duty to teach the world the might of moral beauty and stamp God's image truly on the struggling soul.

President Kennedy in his address at Amherst College, thinking of the future that he would wish and that he foresaw for America, said he wished an America whose military strength would be matched by its moral strength, the moral strength of its people; its wealth by their wisdom; its power by their purpose—an America that would not be afraid of grace and beauty.

In short, he said, an America that would win respect not merely because of its strength but because of its culture. I am sure that is the America that ultimately you would want, as it is the Ireland that we would want.

But these things can only be secured by undeviating pursuit of the foundations that I have mentioned and pursuit, ultimately, of the higher ideals that mean the mental life, the full life of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to confess and confess freely that this is an outstanding day in my own life, to see recognized, as I have here in full, the recognition of the rights of the Irish people and the independence of the Irish people in a way that was not at all possible 45 years ago. [Applause.]

I have longed to come back and say this to you and through you to the people as a whole.

I would, indeed, be fully happy today were there not one serious setback that had occurred in these 45 years.

When I was addressing you here in 1919 and 1920 our ancient nation, our ancient Ireland, was undivided. Since then it has been divided by a cruel partition.

As my predecessor, Mr. Sean T. O'Kelly, when he was addressing you here said, partition is one of our serious problems but, please God, that, too, will be solved.

And I salute here, in prospect, the representative of Ireland who may be permitted to address you as I have been permitted, and who will be able with full heart joyfully to announce to you that our severed country has been reunited and that the last source of enmity between the British and Irish peoples has disappeared and that at last we can be truly friends. [Applause.]

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to renew to you and to the Members of Congress my thanks for this great privilege—and, of course, to the President of the United States, without whose generous invitation I could not be here. I am deeply grateful. I hope that the close ties which have kept our countries together for centuries will continue into the future. [Applause.]

And that representatives of Ireland may be able to talk to the American people as close friends, and representatives of the United States to talk to the people of Ireland as their close friends.

May I pray in our own language, the Irish language, that this may be so:

> Go dtuga Dia gur mar sin a bheas, agus go stiúra an Spiorad Naomh na daoine a bheas mar thereoraithe ar ár ndá thír, agus taoisigh an domhain fré chéile, ar bhealach na síochána agus leasa an chine dhaonna.
>
> (*English Translation:*)
>
> God grant that it be so, and may the Holy Spirit guide the leaders of our two countries, and those of the whole world, on the way of peace and human betterment.

At 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m., the President of the Irish Republic, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order: The members of the President's Cabinet, the ambassadors, ministers, and chargé d'affaires of foreign governments.

The SPEAKER. The joint meeting of the two Houses is hereby dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock p.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 1:45 p.m.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m., the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, the gentleman from Oklahoma

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

[Mr. ALBERT] at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

PROCEEDINGS DURING THE RECESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JUNE 1, 1964

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to make inquiry of the distinguished majority whip concerning the program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio the program for the week of June 1, 1964, is as follows:

On Monday, we have the Consent Calendar.

No bills are scheduled to be taken up under suspension of the rules.

On Tuesday we have the Private Calendar and the following:

House Resolution 648, authorizing additional policemen on the Capitol Police force.

House Resolution 653, providing an additional $150,000 for the Committee on the Judiciary.

House Resolution 658, providing an additional $175,000 for the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

House Resolution 735, providing an additional $125,000 for the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 73, authorizing printing of 2,000 additional copies each of parts II and III of Joint Committee on Atomic Energy's hearings on AEC authorizing legislation for fiscal year 1965.

S. 2, establish water resources research centers. That will come up under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

On Wednesday, H.R. 10503, Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1964. This has an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

H.R. 10392, authorizing the District of Columbia Commissioners to locate a portion of a vehicular tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the U.S. Botanic Garden grounds. This has an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

On Thursday and the balance of the week, House Joint Resolution 977—National Commission on Food Marketing. This has an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1964

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wonder if we could have some idea of when the congressional pay increase bill is going to come up.

Mr. BOGGS. There is a variety of bills reported by the Committee on Rules that are being scheduled, but at this time I am not in a position to give any specific date for that bill. There are many primaries pending all over the country. There is a very hotly contested primary in California on June 2. There are other primaries. In order to accommodate Members on both sides of the aisle we have sought not to schedule controversial legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that if it never comes up it will be too soon as far as I am concerned; but I would like to be assured that it will not come up next week.

Mr. BOGGS. I will say to my distinguished friend from Iowa that it will not come up next week and that he will receive ample notice before it does come up.

Mr. GROSS. Will it come up before the bill increasing the Federal debt limit?

Mr. BOGGS. I am in no position to say when that bill, or the mass transit bill, or ARA, or a host of others, will come up specifically. We have many bills before us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY NEXT WEEK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID—WHY THE CONTROVERSY

(Mr. RYAN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to create a better understanding of the complexities of our foreign policy I have sponsored, in cooperation with the Foreign Policy Association and the Reform Democratic Clubs on Manhattan's west side, a series of forums for the benefit of my constituents. The forums have not only been informative but have stimulated enlightened discussion. I want to take this occasion to commend Mrs. Susan Cohn, the coordinator of the series, and also Daniel J. Nelson, who worked closely with her in organizing the meetings. Their committee has made a valuable contribution to public awareness of foreign policy issues.

On April 23, 1964, we sponsored an important forum on foreign aid entitled "Foreign Aid—Why the Controversy." The meeting was addressed by Paul G. Hoffman, Director, United Nations Special Fund and William D. Rogers, Deputy U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress. Mrs Reginia. Andrews, librarian, Washington Heights Branch Public Library spoke for the Foreign Policy Association, and Henry Krisch of the Barnard College faculty chaired the meeting.

Mr. Speaker, William D. Rogers, Deputy U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress, reviewed the performance of the Alliance for Progress and commented upon its promise for the future. He pointed out:

> In Latin America, the Alliance for Progress is our chief hope for a better hemisphere and a better world. We cannot let it fail.

I include at this point in the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Rogers.

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM D. ROGERS, DEPUTY U.S. COORDINATOR, ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION DISCUSSION GROUP, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 23, 1964

Congressman RYAN, Mr. Hoffman, fellow citizens, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to speak before you. I am all the more pleased that the invitation came through BILL RYAN, who so ably represents you in Washington.

The subject of this meeting, I understand, is "Foreign Aid—Why the Controversy."

Now, frankly, all my own experience with foreign aid has been with Latin America, once the stepchild of our programs, and now, under the Alliance for Progress, one of its brightest features.

So, with your permission, my talk will concentrate on Latin America.

I must confess that I was puzzled over the question posed for me.

This is because I am so firm in my own mind that our aid programs in support of Latin America's own efforts are so clearly in our national interest that I have trouble understanding the reasons for any controversy.

Our aid to Latin America is helping the nations there to maintain themselves free and independent, sharing with us the ideals of representative democracy and free enterprise. It is bringing them closer to the time

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

DESTROY

88TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1423

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 11049

MAY 21, 1964.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 733]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 733, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

O

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

rently calculated average market rates of interest. Under my proposal, the Secretary would be required to do so.

The principal immediate effect of the proposed bill would be to increase the present average yield of the $15 billion of trust fund money in special issues from an average of about 2.95 percent per annum to about 4⅛ percent per annum. As the accompanying table shows, if the special issues in the trust funds portfolios as of February 29, 1964, were switched to issues bearing an interest rate of 4⅛ percent per year, the annual interest income earned by the two funds would be raised from about $444 million to over $620 million—an increase of about $176 million.

This increase in interest income is not, of course, a permanent one. As the special issues now held by the funds mature at dates ranging from 1966 to 1978, the present law, which requires new issues at current market rates, would raise yields as these issues matured. The difference in interest income between that possible under my bill and the income possible under the present statute will, therefore, diminish from 1966 onward and be canceled in 1978. But in the interim period a substantial net addition to trust fund capital will have been made.

These added millions of additional income to the social security fund can be used either to postpone increases in contributions required to finance present benefits or, better, to pay the initial cost of benefit extensions. Among the latter, programs such as the following could be considered:

First. Payment of older worker allowances to workers over 55 years of age, who have exhausted unemployment benefits and now have to wait until they are 62 to receive social security benefits. The Clark subcommittee on employment and manpower of the Senate has recommended that workers in this group who continue to be available for work, retraining, special work projects, or relocation, and estimated to total from 20,000 to 25,000, receive payments of about $2,000 per year, at an annual cost of $50 million to $75 million. If the annual payments to any one person were limited to the average $1,000 per year now paid in social security benefits, the cost would be half that estimated by the Clark subcommittee.

Second. Payment of disability benefits to disabled widows, who now receive no benefits until age 62, irrespective of their age. At a cost of about $100 million per year, a disability pension of about $1,000 per year could be paid to the 100,000 women who fall into this disadvantaged category.

Third. Payment of old age benefits to childless widows at half-benefit rate at age 60. Childless widows of workers who have accumulated social security rights now receive an average of about $70 per month at age 62. An average $35 per month could be paid to the 300,000 childless widows who now compose the group from 60 to 62 at an approximate annual cost of $150 million per year.

Fourth. Payment of extended benefits to children of disabled or retired workers or their survivors. Under the terms of H.R. 6688 proposed by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], children's benefits would continue to be paid until age 22 when the children continued in school. These payments now stop when children reach the age of 18. Extension of benefits to the higher age limit would permit an estimated 200,000 young people to go on to college at an annual cost of some $125 million.

The text of H.R. 11328 follows:

H.R. 11328

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act with respect to the investment of amounts in the social security trust funds

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the fifth sentence of section 201(d) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "(1)" after "except that", and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (2) the rate of interest on such obligations shall in no case be less than 3 per centum per annum".

(b) The sixth sentence of section 201(d) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and the investment yield of such obligations shall not be less than the interest rate determined in accordance with the preceding sentence".

SEC. 2. The Managing Trustee of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund shall, immediately upon the enactment of this Act, retire the special obligations held by such trust funds on the date of the enactment of this Act and issue in lieu thereof special obligations with an interest rate determined as provided for in section 201(d) of the Social Security Act as amended by the first section of this Act.

Multiple	Base	Present gross	Proposed by H.R. 11049	
			Percent increase	New gross
0	$5	$891	0.5	$935
0.1	60	1,020	.5	1,071
	500	2,057	.5	2,160
1	505	2,069	5.5	2,183
2	1,000	3,157	5.5	3,330
2	1,005	3,166	6.5	3,372
2.4	1,200	3,534	6.5	3,764
3	1,500	4,052	6.5	4,316
3	1,505	4,061	7.5	4,366
3.6	1,800	4,655	7.5	5,004
4	2,000	5,088	7.5	5,470
4	2,005	5,099	8.5	5,533
4.8	2,400	5,955	8.5	6,461
5	2,500	6,172	8.5	6,697
5	2,505	6,183	9.5	6,770
6	3,000	7,255	9.5	7,945
6	3,005	7,266	10.5	8,029
7	3,500	8,339	10.5	9,215
7	3,505	8,350	11.5	9,310
7.2	3,600	8,556	11.5	9,540
8	4,000	9,422	11.5	10,506
8	4,005	9,433	12.5	10,613
9	4,500	10,506	12.5	11,819
9	4,505	10,517	13.5	11,937
9.6	4,800	11,136	13.5	12,640
10	5,000	11,550	13.5	13,109
10	5,005	11,560	14.5	13,237
11	5,500	12,528	14.5	14,345
11	5,505	12,538	15.5	14,481
12	6,000	13,469	15.5	15,556
12	6,005	13,478	16.5	15,702
13	6,500	14,409	16.5	16,786
13	6,505	14,418	17.5	16,942
14	7,000	15,349	17.5	18,035
14	7,005	15,359	18.5	18,200
14.4	7,200	15,725	18.5	18,635
15	7,500	16,289	18.5	19,303
15	7,505	16,299	19.5	19,477
16	8,000	17,230	19.5	20,590
16	8,005	17,239	20.5	20,773
17	8,500	18,170	20.5	21,895
17	8,505	18,179	21.5	22,088
17.7	8,880	18,884	21.5	22,945
18	9,000	19,110	21.5	23,219
18	9,005	19,120	22.5	23,422
18.9	9,475	20,000	22.5	24,500

PROVISIONS OF THE REVISED FEDERAL PAY BILL

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, since the Post Office and Civil Service Committee recently voted out H.R. 11049, the revised Federal pay bill, I have had many inquiries concerning provisions of the bill relating to legislative employees—the staffs of congressional committees and the staffs of Senators and Congressmen.

I should like to say that the provisions of this portion of the bill are substantially the same as they were when the House considered the earlier pay bill, H.R. 8986. H.R. 11049 is now before the Rules Committee and I am hoping for approval of a rule and an early debate in the House.

Without objection, I insert a table showing legislative salary increases contained in H.R. 11049:

LEGISLATIVE SALARY INCREASES PROVIDED IN SECTION 202 OF H.R. 11049

This amendment is designed to provide percentage salary adjustments for legislative employees comparable to those provided for employees under the Classification Act. The increases are provided in an amount equal to 3½ percent of the employee's gross rate plus 1 percent of his gross rate for each whole multiple, or part of a multiple of $500 basic compensation; or an amount equal to 5 percent of such gross rate, whichever is greater:

TIME FOR DRASTIC ACTION

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, it appears most unfortunate that a very small minority of college students—college hoodlums would be more appropriate—might well bring discredit to the countless numbers of conscientious students who appreciate the privilege of being able to attend college. The great majority show their appreciation. They not only attempt to learn how to make a living but also the art of making a life.

"Fraternity Confab Turns Into Near Orgy," was a recent headline in a Midwest paper. Thirty-seven students, including 15 coeds, were arrested when the confab turned into a drunken brawl, resulting in considerable damage to a hotel in the town. Pedestrians were endangered when beer cans and bottles were thrown from upper story windows.

More recently the press reported a similar occurrence not very far from the Nation's Capital. Here a cabin was practically wrecked under comparable circumstances.

News media this past Monday morning gave an account of completely irresponsible students from the same institution who chose one of the Wilson Lines pleasure boats to show complete contempt for law and order by throwing deck chairs

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

and life preservers overboard. This was followed by riots with the police force.

An even more shocking incident was reported editorially in the May 18 issue of the York, Pa., Dispatch, which should be required reading for every Member of Congress.

Modern conveniences have brought drastic changes. Improved methods of heating have largely elimnated the woodshed. This might well be the penalty of progress for it was here where many lessons were taught in such manner they were not easily forgotten.

Do we need more woodshed treatments?

An article on this subject follows:

WHILE THE GI'S DIE

Americans are dying in an effort to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam.

Blood is flowing in defense of freedom against a relentless enemy.

Yet right here in Pennsylvania, some collegians are allegedly raising funds that would help the Communists of South Vietnam.

The students said they hoped to dramatize what they called American persecution of people fighting for their national independence, the Associated Press reported.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has been asked to investigated the situation which has reportedly developed on nine campuses.

Somewhere, somehow this handful of collegians has slipped off the track.

When supposedly intelligent young men can equate "national independence" with Communist aggression, it is time for us to find out how their thought processes could become so warped.

The picture of GI's spilling their blood for freedom while fellow Americans raise funds for the opposition is difficult to acknowledge in a world half free and half slave.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include an editorial.)

MARYLAND DEMOCRAT PRIMARY CONFIRMS LOU HARRIS BIAS

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include an article.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the results of yesterday's Maryland Democrat primary prove conclusively that Lou Harris, and all who use his biased poll results including CBS News, have slandered the Republican Party by their previous allegations that the Governor Wallace vote in Indiana was the result of an 11- to 15-percent Republican crossover.

On May 14, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A2518 an exchange of correspondence between myself and Fred Friendly, president of CBS News. At that time, I challenged the CBS-Lou Harris conclusion that the increase in Democrat primary voters in 1964 over 1960 in Indiana came from Republicans who crossed over to vote. Though I make no claim as a political prophet, I said on May 14, that based on the reasoning expressed in Mr. Friendly's letter, a heavier turnout in the Maryland Democrat primary on May 19 would have to be attributed to "Republican crossovers" according to Mr. Harris' logic.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that 497,722 Democrats voted in yesterday's Maryland primary compared to 286,956 Democrats who voted in the 1960 Maryland Democrat primary. Thus, were it not for the known fact that Republicans are prohibited by law from voting in a Democrat primary in Maryland, Lou Harris, CBS, the Washington Post, and I assume NBC and ABC, would today be saying that the Wallace vote in yesterday's Democrat primary represented almost a 70 percent Republican crossover, using the same formula as was then followed to allege an 11 percent GOP crossover in Indiana.

This obvious inconsistency of the Lou Harris logic, plus the notable absence of any published Lou Harris prediction at all regarding the Wallace-Brewster race yesterday, clearly support my contention that CBS has allowed bias to be injected into its reporting of the 1964 political campaign by its use of a former employee of the Democrat National Committee and a Democrat assistant to the President. At the very least I believe the CBS ought to identify Mr. Harris' affiliation and affection for a particular political party so the public will not be under any false impressions when he speaks over the public airwaves.

I also insert into the RECORD at this point, an article in the May 11 issue of the Christian Science Monitor raising still another question about Mr. Harris' ethics, and also an article from the May 17 issue of the New York Times, raising a question about his ability.

I also want to stress, Mr. Speaker, that I have told Mr. Friendly of CBS News that I will insert any response that he wishes to make in reply to my letter of May 14. Thus far I have received none.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 17, 1964]

POLL TAKERS OFF TO SPOTTY START—ACCURACY HAS BEEN MIXED IN FIRST PRIMARY RACES

Professional news polling has got off to a shaky start in this election year when polls will be more extensively published, broadcast and alluded to than ever before.

Pollster forecasts can be checked with certainty only against election results. And in the major ballot-box tests to date—the Republican Presidential primaries in Oregon on Friday and in New Hampshire on March 10—one nationally syndicated pollster accurately predicted the winners, and another proved to be wrong both times.

Governor Rockefeller inadvertently pointed up the significance of professional news polls when he revealed yesterday that he first thought he would win in Oregon "when I read Sam Lubell's column."

He was referring to Samuel Lubell, who polls for the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

In his final Oregon primary report last Tuesday Mr. Lubell forecast a "surprise" and "perhaps even an upset" by Governor Rockefeller.

Mr. Lubell, who flatly predicts or "indicates" probable winners, but does not forecast vote percentages, also foretold the upset in New Hampshire where Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge confounded political experts by sweeping the primary as a write-in candidate.

On the other hand, Louis Harris, another nationally published election forecaster, missed the actual result by wide margins in both States.

Mr. Harris, formerly confidential political pollster for President Kennedy, Mayor Wagner and others, now is conducting a news poll for the Los Angeles Times syndicate.

The pre-Oregon Harris Poll, published Thursday, reported: "Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge appears assured of victory over five opponents."

Mr. Harris predicted Mr. Lodge would win with 35 percent of the vote; Governor Rockefeller would be second with 24 percent; former Vice President Richard M. Nixon would be third, with 21 percent; Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, would be fourth, with 16 percent and Senator Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, and Gov. William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania, would trail in fifth and sixth place.

In the actual Oregon vote, however, Governor Rockefeller won with 33 percent of the votes; Mr. Lodge was second, with 27 percent; Senator Goldwater third, with 18 percent, and Mr. Nixon fourth, with 17 percent. Mrs. Smith and Mr. Scranton did trail badly.

Thus the Harris poll failed to predict the winner and missed Mr. Rockefeller's percentage of the vote by nine points.

That sizable error was an improvement, however, over Mr. Harris's forecasts in New Hampshire.

The election eve Harris poll, as reported in the New York Post and some 100 other newspapers, indicated a trend to Mr. Lodge, but predicted that Senator GOLDWATER would win, with 26 percent of the vote, and Mr. Lodge would tie Governor Rockefeller for second place, each getting 24 percent.

When the ballots were counted Mr. Lodge turned out to be the victor. His total vote more than 35 percent of those cast—was 11 percent higher than the Harris forecast.

Mr. Harris and others have explained the reasons for the errors in a variety of ways, and there are likely to be more explanations in the weeks ahead.

In the modern public opinion polling profession an error of approximately 3 percentage points is considered reasonable because of flaws in the science of statistical sampling by which a cross-section of the voting population is selected to be questioned by the pollsters.

The Harris poll's miscalculations as to the vote in Oregon and New Hampshire are somewhat larger than that of the Gallup poll in 1948, but slightly under the celebrated mistake of the Literary Digest poll in 1936.

In the Truman-Dewey election of 1948, all national pollsters missed the mark by forecasting victory for Governor Dewey. The Gallup poll's margin of error was a bit under 5 percent.

The Literary Digest poll in 1936 forecast Gov. Alf M. Landon's election over President Roosevelt by a landslide. Mr Roosevelt thereupon won by the biggest majority in modern times.

Dr. Gallup, Mr. Lubell, Elmo Roper and other national news pollsters in the 1960 Presidential contest predicted the unusually slim vote margin between President Kennedy and Mr Nixon with remarkable accuracy.

All forecasts were within 1 percentage point of the result.

The Gallup poll reports only on a national and regional basis, and does not sample opinion in State contests. Therefore it offered no predictions in the Oregon and New Hampshire primaries.

Mr. Roper, like Dr. Gallup a dean of modern professional polling, is not yet conducting a news poll of the 1964 campaign.

It was noted yesterday that the most accurate poll in Oregon was a nonprofessional survey by Zan Stark of United Press International's Oregon bureau. After a poll of members of the State Legislature, he predicted on March 24 that Governor Rocke-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

He tells them, like the businessmen, that this country's international competitive position, which deteriorated sharply in the decade of the 1950's, has recently recovered, but that it could slip back again if wage costs, and hence prices began to rise again. He praises them for a recent record in which average wage increases have been only as large as annual average gains in productivity.

Then the President, and the Council of Economic Advisers, urge that the unions simply maintain that record, and that they ask for increases only in line with productivity gains for the whole economy, which have averaged 3.2 percent annually for the last 5 years.

EVASION EASY

The difficulty with these general "guideposts" is that they are very easy to evade in specific situations. Suppose the paper industry, for example, despite rapidly rising labor productivity, has been in a period of depressed profits and urgently wants to raise prices as soon as competitive conditions permit?

Suppose the United Automobile Workers believe that industry profits are simply "too high," and that the industry can easily "afford" a wage increase of 5 percent without raising prices? This is the position Walter P. Reuther, president of the auto workers, has taken.

The record of this and other countries has not been particularly good in jawbone attacks. The performance this time may be no better.

This does not necessarily mean, however, a general rise in the price level. That would depend on many other factors besides individual wage bargaining and leading-industry price decisions. But if the price level does start to creep up, what does the President have in reserve?

The chief answer is monetary policy—a move by the Federal Reserve Board toward a position of greater tightness of credit and higher interest rates.

CURB ON BOOM

Such a policy would work to curb overall demand and spending in the economy. Thus it would undoubtedly slow down the boom, without necessarily working very quickly to check the price increases. That is why President Johnson does not want to use it unless absolutely necessary.

Thus the monetary and fiscal weapons are at hand to halt inflation, as the 1955–58 inflation was eventually halted. But use of these weapons would virtually guarantee the continuation of high unemployment and might even bring on a recession.

Thus jawbone it is, at least for now. With the existence of idle plant and idle labor, the administration is convinced that the United States need not suffer an inflation caused by excess demand. And it believes that "responsible" behavior by business and labor is a reasonable hope, to prevent an independent "cost-push" inflation caused by private decisions.

Restrictions Eased Against Polish Protest Signers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, addressing the House in commemoration of the Polish Constitution of May 3 on April 30, I referred to the reprisals taken by the Polish Government against signers of a letter of protest against restrictions of freedom of information and discussion.

At that time, it was my expressed hope that Polish leaders would reconsider their policies toward the intellectuals who signed the protest letter.

I was gratified to note a press report last Sunday that disciplinary actions against the signers apparently are being rescinded. This indeed is good news and the Polish Government is to be encouraged for its enlightened reappraisal of the situation.

Let us hope that this action is only the first in a series by which Polish writers, scholars, and scientists are given the freedom necessary to pursue their work. Continuing liberalization of the Communist regime in Poland would go far toward advancing Polish culture and learning, and would be received with approval in the entire world.

Under permission granted, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a copy of the story on the situation by Correspondent Paul Underwood which appeared in the New York Times on May 17:

POLISH REPRISALS IN PROTEST EASED—PASSPORTS ISSUED TO SIGNERS OF ATTACK ON CENSORSHIP

(By Paul Underwood)

WARSAW, May 14.—A Polish scholar, Jan Kott, left Warsaw by air for Vienna this week to accept an international prize for his essays on Shakespeare.

There would be nothing especially noteworthy about his trip except that Professor Kott was one of 34 prominent Polish intellectuals who signed a letter to the Government in March protesting official censorship.

The letter raised a storm, particularly after reports had circulated within Poland and abroad that reprisals had been taken against some of the signers.

According to Warsaw rumor, Dr. Kott was one of several who had been disciplined by having applications for passports refused. Others were reported to have been suspended from their jobs.

How many of the rumors were originally true is difficult to ascertain. Many of them seem to have been. But the authorities are now moving to prove most of them untrue, at least as of the present time.

Professor Kott is one of several to receive passports in recent weeks. University sources said that as of now none of the signers is under suspension from teaching duties. Only the column once written by the poet Antoni Slominski is still missing from the humorous magazine Szpilki.

The authorities have moved to a new kind of counteroffensive aimed at making foreigners the villains for allegedly trying to use the incident to discredit the Polish regime.

The Warsaw newspaper Zycie Warszawa carried a statement signed by 155 Polish writers earlier this week protesting what it called "foreign interference with our internal problems and with our cultural policy, which is the common problem of the creative intelligentsia and the political and governmental leadership of the country."

Today's issue reported that 233 more persons had signed the statement. The newspaper also reprinted a letter sent to the Times of London and signed by 10 of the original 34 protesters objecting to what were described as factual errors in published reports of the affair.

Professor Kott, who was not reported to have signed either this week's statement or the letter to the British newspaper, said today he had received his passport "several days ago."

He had been invited to attend ceremonies at the University of Vienna tomorrow at which the German-financed Herder Prize for literature will be bestowed on him. The prize carries with it an award of 10,000 Swiss francs (about $2,287).

American Society for Public Administration Favors Federal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement of the National Capital Area Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration favoring increased salaries for legislative, judicial, and executive officials.

The statement follows:

PAY OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS

By any standard, the present salaries of Members of Congress, the Federal judiciary, and high-level Federal executives are inadequate and inequitable.

They are inadequate in view of the range, complexity, and overwhelming importance of the Government's activities. The Government needs the highest type of managerial and professional accomplishment in the executive branch and needs farseeing leadership in Congress and on the Federal bench. Existing remuneration is disproportionate to the responsibilities of high national office and is incompatible with compensation standards in business and in other fields of public service.

Present Federal salaries for those officials are inequitable when compared with executive pay in private firms and some other governmental jurisdictions. While such salaries need not be directly comparable with the private sector, the gap has become dangerously large. Individuals should not be expected to make excessive sacrifices for the privilege of public service nor should inadequate pay restrict Federal office to those with independent means.

Current salary limitations at the top also block appropriate increases in the upper portions of the career civil service. Under present legislation, such a confused pay situation exists that some supervisors make less than their subordinates. Promotions become adverse personnel actions, and many levels of responsibility within an agency are compressed within a salary spread of a few hundred dollars.

The President's Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems has recommended a Federal executive salary structure ranging up to a Cabinet Secretary salary of $50,000; congressional pay of $35,000; and Federal judiciary pay from $35,000 to $60,500. These proposals would increase the Federal payroll by less than two-tenths of 1 percent. Several bills now before Congress include modified versions of the Panel's recommendations.

The National Capital Area Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration urges Congress to enact promptly an adequate salary structure for high Federal officers. This action will further the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

salary reform begun with the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 and will provide our National Government a more equitable and adequate salary structure.

Lively Doings for Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, as a nation, it is our duty to do all we can to enable our older people to enjoy the leisure years so deservedly earned through decades of hard work and sacrifice. One highly important way in which this obligation can be met is by providing suitable housing. Older people face special problems in finding suitable homes. These problems include the fact that a very high proportion of the elderly are in the lowest income brackets; their age makes it difficult or impossible for them to obtain mortgage financing on liberal terms; and some special design and neighborhood features are needed to meet their housing requirements adequately.

The various Federal aids designed to meet this problem have been of tremendous value in enabling our communities to provide good housing suited to the requirements of senior citizens and thereby helps them to achieve better, fuller lives. The city of East Orange, N.J., which enjoys a national recognition as one of the cleanest, most progressive cities in the Nation, has characteristically constructed a most attractive project "Concord Gardens" for senior citizens and has developed an excellent program of activities for them. Mr. George R. Genung, Jr., the able executive director of the city of East Orange, recently stated:

The city of East Orange and housing authority are not only very proud of our outstanding first public housing project, but are gratified by the excellent senior citizens program that is being carried on at the building. The combination of a superior building, excellent management, and a comprehensive social, health, and recreation program are the elements that have our local councilmen demanding a similar project in their ward.

I am pleased to insert below a story that appeared in the Newark Sunday News on April 26, 1964, which gives recognition to the excellent program being carried out at Concord Towers:

LIVELY DOINGS FOR ELDERLY—EAST ORANGE PLANS PROGRAMS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

(By Don Dust)

A concerted, citywide effort is in progress in East Orange to make life for its senior citizens interesting and lively.

An exceptional combination of volunteer talent and city agencies, centered on the first floor of Concord Towers at 210 Grove Street, is working at a four-point program of recreation, education, health and information.

Concord Towers is a sleek, new, 64-unit, 9-story building where 82 older people pay moderate rents for the specially designed housing. The main floor of the building, however, is devoted to the use of the entire senior citizen population, 11,063, or 14.3 percent of the entire city population.

The day center, as it is called, is under the sponsorship of the mayor's council on senior citizens, which handles funds for the center's financial support.

IMPROVED OUTLOOK

Mrs. Peter E. Ollendorf, council chairman, said the active atmosphere prevailing at the center has improved not only the outlook of the people using it, but, in some cases, their health. The people who are making use of the center are encouraging their friends to drop by, she said.

On Mondays, Thursdays, and Fridays, the floor buzzes with activity. Within the octagonal building there are groups playing cards, other games, watching television, reading or taking lessons in cooking, attending weekly film programs and, when weather permits, outdoor games of shuffleboard and croquet.

The setup is complex, with 8 agencies and 75 aides gearing their activities toward the city's senior citizens.

The city council paid $6,900 for part of the furnishings of the center. The health department has given influenza shots, and conducted diabetes tests there. The recreation commission, under the supervision of Mrs. Delley Coleman, handles the activity programs, and the library has donated 500 books and makes films, slides and records available.

OTHER SUPPORT

Members of the Junior League of the Oranges and Short Hills are paying Stanley S. Moss, the center's acting director for this year, a $5,000 stipend. The league also has five members staffing a counseling and referral service.

The service is designed to direct senior citizens with problems to agencies and people who can help them. The problems include social security questions, and health and welfare problems. The United Community Service is training the Junior Leaguers for this service.

Meals on Wheels, an organization which delivers prepared meals to people unable to cook for themselves, uses the kitchen in the center to cook and package the food. The Red Cross sends a representative once a week to teach methods of cooking for one and two people, economically and with limited facilities. This is geared mainly to people who live outside the project.

A "get well cupboard" makes available for modest rentals wheelchairs, special beds, and all kinds of other equipment for recuperating elderly people. The cupboard is run and financed by the united churchwomen of the city.

George R. Genung, executive director of the city's housing authority termed the abundance of activity and interest "unique." The authority is responsible for constructing and tenanting the building. Genung is quite pleased that while most public housing developments suffer from a lack of community interest, this one is enjoying success.

Big Man for a Big Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRAHAM PURCELL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 20, 1964

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, Texans are proud of our able friend and colleague, Congressman GEORGE MAHON, the new chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. They are proud of his record of service in the Congress, and his dedication to the best interests of the United States. I share this feeling of pride with other Texans. Since I came to the Congress, I have come to know GEORGE MAHON as a dedicated American, an outstanding statesman, and a wonderful friend.

The distinguished publisher of the Vernon (Tex.) Daily Record, Mr. T. B. Quillin, recognizes the capability of Chairman MAHON to handle the tremendous responsibility which now rests on his shoulders. In an editorial on May 17, 1964, titled "Big Man for a Big Job" the Vernon Daily Record congratulated Mr. MAHON, and expressed its confidence that the Committee on Appropriations is in good hands.

Also, Mr. Speaker, on that same date, the Dallas Morning News carried a very fine article on Chairman MAHON written by Mike Quinn, titled "Representative George Mahon: Scholar, Statesman."

I commend both the editorial and the article to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Vernon (Tex.) Daily Record, May 17, 1964]

BIG MAN FOR A BIG JOB

Death of Representative Clarence Cannon of Missouri at 85, dean of the House and longtime chairman of the important Appropriations Committee, shifts the spotlight to a highly respected Texan, GEORGE MAHON, of Lubbock, Member of Congress since 1934, who, as ranking Democrat on the committee, is scheduled to succeed to the chairmanship.

The late Representative Cannon was distinguished in a number of ways, skilled parliamentarian, length of service, but more especially as an advocate of economy in Government. Size of appropriations in recent years suggest that efforts in the direction of economy had met with little success, but it would be hard to estimate the number of billions the tough-minded, tough-talking Missourian trimmed from money requests from the executive branch of the Government.

Even more significant is the fact that the cuts would have been much deeper if the full committee and ultimately the House had followed Mr. Cannon's recommendations. The chairman of a congressional committee can have great influence on the fate of legislation considered by his committee. But there are definite limits on his authority as, of course, there should be.

But in GEORGE MAHON the House of Representatives will have leadership quite as capable and quite as devoted to prudent spending of tax money as the late Mr. Cannon has been. It is doubtful if any Member of Congress has greater knowledge or better understanding of the overall Government establishment.

Mr. MAHON's long service as a member of the Appropriations Committee make him uniquely qualified for the tremendously important duties that go with the chairmanship. Oftentimes there is voiced a criticism of the custom of making committee assignments, and particularly the chairmanships, on the basis of seniority. But in this instance seniority and qualifications happen to meet.

Congratulations are in order. To GEORGE MAHON for recognition and an honor based on integrity and devotion to duty, but more importantly to the Nation in the fact that one of the most powerful committees in Congress will be under capable leadership.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

fact, through the past 2 or 3 days, about some attempt, as my good friend [Mr. BALDWIN] remarked, to sneak this through. This is absolutely erroneous. This again is some of the typical Washington press reporting that all too often we have to experience. There was a report this morning that the Congress had never voted, nor had stood up and been counted, on pay increases. Again, to make it clear, in case the press does not understand how to determine what happened, I should like to refer to the situation on February 16, 1955, on rollcall No. 5, where the House of Representatives voted 283 in favor of and 118 against a pay increase for the Members of Congress.

Again on the conference report on March 1, 1955, rollcall No. 13, the House voted 223 in favor of the conference report and 113 against it.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of this rule. I urge the adoption of the rule so that the House may resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and debate and consider the merits of what I believe to be a very fine bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 251, nays 147, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—251

Addabbo	Daddario	Harvey, Ind.
Albert	Daniels	Hawkins
Anderson	Davis, Ga.	Hays
Ashley	Dawson	Hébert
Aspinall	Delaney	Henderson
Auchincloss	Dent	Holifield
Barrett	Denton	Holland
Barry	Derounian	Horton
Battin	Diggs	Hosmer
Becker	Dingell	Ichord
Bell	Downing	Jennings
Bennett, Mich.	Dulski	Joelson
Blatnik	Dwyer	Johnson, Calif.
Boggs	Edmondson	Jones, Mo.
Boland	Edwards	Karsten
Bolton, Frances P.	Ellsworth	Karth
	Evins	Kastenmeier
Bolton, Oliver P.	Fallon	Kee
	Farbstein	Keith
Bonner	Fascell	Kelly
Bow	Feighan	Keogh
Brooks	Fino	Kilgore
Brotzman	Flood	King, N.Y.
Broyhill, N.C.	Fogarty	Kirwan
Broyhill, Va.	Fountain	Kluczynski
Buckley	Fraser	Kornegay
Burke	Frelinghuysen	Kunkel
Burkhalter	Friedel	Lankford
Burton, Calif.	Fulton, Pa.	Leggett
Byrne, Pa.	Fulton, Tenn.	Lesinski
Cahill	Gallagher	Libonati
Cameron	Garmatz	Lindsay
Cannon	Gary	Long, La.
Carey	Giaimo	Long, Md.
Casey	Gibbons	McCulloch
Cederberg	Gilbert	McDowell
Celler	Gill	McFall
Chamberlain	Glenn	McIntire
Chelf	Gonzalez	McMillan
Chenoweth	Grabowski	Macdonald
Clark	Gray	Madden
Cohelan	Grover	Mailliard
Collier	Gubser	Martin, Mass.
Conte	Hagen, Calif.	Matsunaga
Cooley	Halpern	May
Corbett	Hanna	Michel
Corman	Hansen	Miller, Calif.
Cramer	Hardy	Miller, N.Y.
Cunningham	Harrison	Milliken
Mills	Reid, N.Y.	Talcott
Minish	Reifel	Taylor
Monagan	Reuss	Teague, Calif.
Moorhead	Riehlman	Teague, Tex.
Morgan	Rivers, Alaska	Thomas
Morrison	Rivers, S.C.	Thompson, La.
Morse	Robison	Thompson, N.J.
Moss	Rodino	Thompson, Tex.
Multer	Rogers, Colo.	Toll
Murphy, Ill.	Rooney, N.Y.	Tollefson
Murphy, N.Y.	Rooney, Pa.	Trimble
Murray	Roosevelt	Tupper
Natcher	Rostenkowski	Tuten
Nedzi	Roush	Udall
Nix	Roybal	Ullman
O'Brien, N.Y.	Ryan, Mich.	Van Deerlin
O'Hara, Ill.	Ryan, N.Y.	Vanik
O'Hara, Mich.	St Germain	Van Pelt
Olsen, Mont.	St. Onge	Vinson
Olson, Minn.	Senner	Waggonner
O'Neill	Shipley	Wallhauser
Osmers	Sibal	Watts
Ostertag	Sickles	Weltner
Passman	Sisk	Westland
Patman	Slack	White
Patten	Smith, Calif.	Whitener
Pelly	Smith, Iowa	Widnall
Pepper	Staebler	Wilson Bob
Perkins	Stafford	Wilson, Charles H.
Pike	Staggers	
Pool	Steed	Wright
Price	Stephens	Wydler
Pucinski	Stinson	Young
Purcell	Stratton	Younger
Quie	Stubblefield	Zablocki
Randall	Sullivan	

NAYS—147

Abbitt	Grant	Norblad
Abele	Griffin	O'Konski
Abernethy	Griffiths	Pickle
Adair	Gross	Pilcher
Alger	Gurney	Pillion
Andrews, Ala.	Hagan, Ga.	Pirnie
Andrews, N. Dak.	Haley	Poage
	Hall	Poff
Arends	Halleck	Quillen
Ashbrook	Harris	Reid, Ill.
Ashmore	Harsha	Rhodes, Ariz.
Avery	Harvey, Mich.	Rhodes, Pa.
Baldwin	Hechler	Rich
Baring	Herlong	Roberts, Tex.
Beckworth	Hoeven	Rogers, Fla.
Beermann	Horan	Rogers, Tex.
Belcher	Huddleston	Roudebush
Bennett, Fla.	Hull	Rumsfeld
Berry	Hutchinson	St. George
Betts	Jarman	Saylor
Bray	Jensen	Schadeberg
Brock	Johansen	Schenck
Bromwell	Johnson, Pa.	Schneebeli
Broomfield	Johnson, Wis.	Schweiker
Brown, Ohio	Jonas	Schwengel
Bruce	Jones, Ala.	Secrest
Burleson	Kilburn	Selden
Burton, Utah	Knox	Short
Byrnes, Wis.	Kyl	Shriver
Clancy	Laird	Sikes
Clausen, Don H.	Landrum	Siler
	Latta	Skubitz
Clawson, Del	Lennon	Smith, Va.
Cleveland	Lipscomb	Snyder
Curtin	Lloyd	Springer
Curtis	McClory	Taft
Dague	McDade	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	McLoskey	Tuck
Devine	MacGregor	Utt
Dole	Mahon	Watson
Everett	Marsh	Weaver
Findley	Martin, Calif.	Whalley
Fisher	Martin, Nebr.	Wharton
Flynt	Matthews	Whitten
Ford	Minshall	Wickersham
Ford, Gerald R.	Montoya	Williams
Forrester	Moore	Wilson, Ind.
Fuqua	Morris	Winstead
Gathings	Morton	Wyman
Goodell	Mosher	

NOT VOTING—34

Ayres	Elliott	Nelsen
Bass	Finnegan	O'Brien, Ill.
Bates	Goodling	Philbin
Bolling	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Brademas	Harding	Rains
Brown, Calif.	Healey	Roberts, Ala.
Colmer	Hemphill	Rosenthal
Davis, Tenn.	Hoffman	Scott
Donohue	King, Calif.	Sheppard
Dorn	Langen	Willis
Dowdy	Mathias	
Duncan	Meader	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. King of California for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.
Mr. Bates for, with Mr. Goodling against.
Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Langen against.
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Healey with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Finnegan.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Brown of California.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Rains with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Roberts, of Alabama.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Harding.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Duncan.

Messrs. RHODES of Pennsylvania, WATSON, DON H. CLAUSEN, SCHADEBERG, PIRNIE, MORTON, McLOSKEY, and HARVEY of Michigan changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I was temporarily absent from the Chamber. I did not hear the second bell ring, and I did not hear my name called. I am very anxious to vote. Do I qualify?

The SPEAKER. Having in mind the statement just made by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the Chair is reluctantly constrained to rule that he cannot vote; he does not qualify.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under the rules am I permitted to state how I would have voted had I qualified?

The SPEAKER. Not at this particular time.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, had I been able to qualify on the vote just taken, I would have voted "no" on the resolution.

MODERNIZATION OF FEDERAL SALARY SYSTEMS

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8986) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8986, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

[Mr. CORBETT] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 8986 as reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with certain amendments which I understand will be proposed with the agreement of the majority of the members of that committee.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation comes from the great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service by a vote of more than 2 to 1 after extensive hearings on and consideration of a legislative proposal of the administration. The committee's public hearings, which began August 13 and extended through September 24 of last year, developed what is recognized to be the most authoritative and informed testimony on all major Federal statutory systems that have as yet been presented.

The committee bill was drawn on the basis of these extensive hearings and the overwhelming weight of the evidence there presented. The committee deserves the gratitude and the support of the House.

Mr. Chairman, the policies and principles embodied in the bill before us, as well as a major amendment to be proposed to title I, will be explained in detail by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] and other members of the committee. I will, therefore, confine my remarks principally to the provisions of title II dealing with legislative salaries. I do this with the assurance in my own mind that this legislation is needed. I also assure the committee that I will support all of the provisions of the bill and the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

I think it is abundantly evident by this time that the ultimate key to the modernization of all major Federal statutory salary systems intended by this legislation lies in section 204 of the bill which amends the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to increase the salaries of Members of Congress. There is one important facet of that section which, were it not considered, could result in the substantial destruction of the essential purpose and objectives of the entire bill. The level of congressional salaries, if set too low, operates as a compressive ceiling on the entire classified and postal salary schedules and on most executive and judicial salaries.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is easy to understand the position of those who have always opposed any legislation in this area for anyone, including postal and classified employees. But in view of the certain ultimate effect on the salaries of such employees, it is difficult for me to understand the position of those who want to legislate in that field without legislating also in the field of congressional, judicial, and higher grade executive salaries.

Consider, if you will, the fundamental question of proper salary relationships within and among the various salary systems—the executive, legislative, and judicial. As pointed out in the committee report, these relationships have been thoroughly analyzed by the committee and unfair and damaging distortions under existing law have been disclosed.

The committee bill will correct these distortions and restore proper relationships. But as important as may be the effect of congressional salary levels on other Federal salaries, the committee's recommendations should also be supported on other grounds.

First of all, the congressional salary level provided in the bill is reasonable. It represents a percentage materially less than that provided by the last congressional salary bill almost 9 years ago, and it is $2,500 below the level recommended by the Randall Panel and, in turn, recommended by both President Kennedy and President Johnson.

Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate the difficulty that faces a Member in reaching a decision on increasing his own salary, but the Constitution gives the Member this responsibility and he must face up to it with fairness and with courage.

Certainly logic dictates that Members of Congress should receive compensation which will enable them fully and effectively to devote their time to the problems of the high offices which they hold.

Each Member of Congress represents Americans ranging in number from 180,000 in the smallest district to 18 million or more in the largest State. Collectively Members of the House and Senate bring to bear the full force of the views of 190 million Americans on the policies, programs, and operations of our Government. They are the only means by which the voice of the people can be applied directly in national affairs.

They bear the ultimate responsibility for decisions, the wisdom, timeliness, and practicality of which determine the domestic interests of this country and the world position of the United States. There is no office or position in private life or at any other governmental level which approaches these requirements of public accountability and responsibility in the Federal Government.

The proposed increases are needed. The unreimbursed expenses of Members of Congress far exceed those of any other official or employee of the Federal Government. A Member of Congress must maintain two homes and two offices—one of each in his district and in Washington. A Member of the House must undergo the expense of a political campaign every 2 years.

He is sharply limited in the number of trips which he may make at public expense between his district and Washington—at a time, as now, when every Member must keep in closer touch with the thinking and the views of his constituents than ever before. He is the chief proponent and supporter of the fundamental doctrine of the "consent of the governed" and the public welfare, but is denied the wherewithal to comply with this mandate. He must all too often dip into his own pocket for a great deal of expenditures on totally official matters.

A Federal-private enterprise executive salary comparison cannot really be made, and on this I agree with the gentlewoman from New York. A recent sampling of 1,157 private enterprise manufacturing corporations disclosed a median salary of $91,000 for the top paid officers.

But setting that aside, executive, congressional and judicial salaries have been permitted to fall far below even those paid in many State and municipal governments. The State of California alone has 135 governmental positions which pay more than $25,000 a year. Pennsylvania has 165, Illinois has 92 and New York has 432. The Governor of New York receives $50,000 plus the use of an executive mansion. The mayor of New York receives $50,000. Los Angeles pays the general manager of its water and power departments more than $40,000. The general manager of the Boston Transit Authority receives $40,000, and the superintendent of Chicago schools is paid $48,500.

In the field of education—so long the subject of concern over the dearth of good teachers and educators due to low salaries—we find that 81 college presidents now are being paid more than $25,000 per year. The principal full-time officers of 17 charitable foundations receive more than $35,000 per year.

Although the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries in 1954 recommended salaries of $27,500 for Members of Congress, a recommendation that was strongly supported by President Eisenhower, that recommendation was reduced by $5,000 in the Act of March 2, 1955. Thus the adjustments made in such salaries 9 years ago were well below recommended levels at that time. Additionally, the relationship of compensation of Members of Congress—the necessary and proper differentials between their salaries, on the one hand, and the salaries of other Government officials and career employees on the other, has been further and unsoundly altered.

Mr. Chairman, complaint has been made about the fact that congressional, judicial, and high level executive salaries are increased in this bill disproportionately to increases made at lower levels, but the point is that these salaries—executive, judicial, and legislative salaries—have not been increased since 1955 whereas postal and classified employees have been given six salary increases since that time. These increases have been cumulative one on the other, and in the aggregate have amounted, I am advised, to approximately 51 percent for classified employees and nearly 55 percent for postal employees.

The committee bill recognizes that the achievement of full salary comparability with private enterprise, for high Government offices, is not practical and, of

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

course, it does not recommend it. It would be unwholesome if the compensation in Government were at such levels that men sought appointments as a matter of personal financial advancement.

There must be, and fortunately there are, outstanding citizens of ability and dedication who will accept public office and the many demands of public office from a sense of dedication to public service, putting aside their personal financial interests; but it is even more economically and morally unsupportable in my judgment to keep compensation of the most important and critical Government offices at such low levels that only the rich can be persuaded to accept them. Moreover, it is grossly unfair and improvident to subject capable and patriotic appointed or elected officials of limited means to drastic sacrifices due to austerity levels of compensation.

On this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to a great speech delivered on the floor of this House in 1925 by one of the great Americans of his generation, Ogden Mills, a distinguished Republican and able former Secretary of the Treasury in the office of President Hoover. Mr. Mills at that time one of the wealthiest men in Congress, said in part:

> Now it seems to me that there is one class of men that we do not want to see as Members of Congress; that is, men to whom (the) salary * * * is an inducement. And it seems to me that it would be undesirable if Congress were composed exclusively of a group of men whose personal fortunes made the matter of salary a matter of total indifference to them, because they would obviously represent too limited a class for a truly representative body.
>
> Gentlemen talk of economy—

Said Mr. Mills, quoting him further,

> and I frankly disagree with the gentlemen on the other side of the House—

Which was our side then—

> who insist on what I consider the worst kind of economy, the economy which consists in getting the second and third best at bargain rates. The proper economy in business is to pay salary that will enlist the most competent service.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that to many Members, I should think to most Members, this is somewhat a delicate question. It is not easy for any individual in any walk of life to pass judgment on the value of his own service. Certainly it is not becoming of us to claim that we are worth thus and so. But the difficulty of this job and the personal problems involved are not the criterion. This matter involves the position of the Congress within the Federal structure. It involves the caliber of men and women who might be attracted to these Halls. And it involves their ability, whether they are men and women of means or not, to perform their jobs fully and effectively.

Certainly this, Mr. Chairman, is a matter in the interest of the American people and of the Republic itself.

Mr. Chairman, while comparisons may not be controlling, they are certainly challenging and in my judgment conclusive as to the dangerous inadequacies of the Federal salaries in the highest places. Reformation, it seems to me, is urgently needed and will be provided in H.R. 8986 to attract and to keep in key posts the best brains and skills that our democratic system can develop.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman on a fine presentation. But he overlooked any reference to the salaries of some of the employees of the House whose salaries are stated in specific terms. Would the gentleman care to make any comment on that?

Mr. ALBERT. This is a matter which the committee has under consideration and I should like to yield to the gentleman from Arizona on that question.

Mr. UDALL. There has been consideration given and considerable criticism concerning the salaries fixed in the committee bill for the Clerk of the House, the Sergeant at Arms, the Postmaster and some of the other employees. I have an amendment which I shall offer and which I believe will have the support of the majority of the committee on this side and on the other side which will make substantial reductions in those salaries, so that these employees will get no larger a percentage of increase than the members of the classified service, or the employees of the classified service. The increase will be slightly over $4,000. I trust my amendment will be adopted. I shall be glad to give the gentleman any further information he may wish about it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] who has long been a member of the committee.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill we now have before us for consideration. The subject of this bill is of a continuous nature. It is a problem which we must face and I think it is a problem that we have never solved completely and possibly never will. The reason why it is so difficult to solve the problem is because it is the result of inflation and the result of the consequent increases in the cost of living.

Mr. Chairman, this is a problem that we have had before us many times. Most of the things which will be said here today have been said many times before. However, we are here today emphasizing another phase of this problem. Some of us have tried to emphasize this phase in the past but it has not been heard loudly enough. In the past we have generally considered two other factors to be of more importance. The first one was this matter of inflation and the increase in the cost of living, recognizing that many of the employees in our Government weren't able to provide themselves and their families and their loved ones with the basic necessities of life. So, we approached the problem from the standpoint of actually permitting these people to sustain a better way of life.

Then, Mr. Chairman, the second approach which we used and considered in the past was one of a political nature. I am not criticizing anyone generally because certainly I have always recognized the political facts of life and have been as interested as anyone in providing the best salaries and working conditions possible for the people whom it is my honor to represent.

Mr. Chairman, I commend and congratulate the postal unions for taking the lead in the past and for bringing the importance of this matter to our attention. However, as I have said before, we are emphasizing another phase of the problem at this time. This phase has been very eloquently stated by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. This is the problem of competition.

Mr. Chairman, we are in effect managers or members of the board of directors of a big business. The Federal Government has on its payrolls approximately 2.5 million employees who constitute a payroll in the neighborhood of $14 billion a year. They are managing a budget of approximately $98 to $100 billion a year. I pose the question, Is not the quality of that personnel a most important factor here? Do we not want the best type people working for our Federal Government? I believe it is vital that we be competitive in every field of personnel relationships.

Mr. Chairman, the 87th Congress recognized that and came forward with a law back in 1962 which stated that we had to be competitive in every field with free enterprise and instructed the executive branch of our Government to make a study annually and to report annually to the Congress as to what should be done in order to be and remain competitive at each of these levels.

Mr. Chairman, this will represent the first action by the Congress since that act of 1962. Actually, we are already 2 years behind in meeting this competition. This is actually a pay adjustment, although I recognize that it does result in an increase in pay. However, it is still an effort to adjust the pay of Federal employees with like trades, like levels, like techniques in free enterprise.

I do not feel, therefore, that we can renege on this. We must not renege. We have directed this study and this report, and we have recognized that a continuous study is necessary. So why should we now refuse after having admitted 2 years ago that such a level of comparability was extremely necessary?

Mr. Chairman, this is not a perfect bill. Any measure that is highly technical as is this one is extremely difficult to perfect to the satisfaction of everyone. It is a compromise. I believe it has been said many, many times in the past that all major legislation is enacted as the result of give and take on the part of everyone.

Mr. Chairman, we realize that the cost of this bill is most controversial, approximately $545 million after pending amendments are adopted. I believe that the vast majority of the membership of this House wants to do everything pos-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

sible to reduce expenditures and someday, someway, somehow balance this budget.

The question is: Can we actually avoid this pay bill or this pay adjustment? Would it be pennywise and pound foolish to ignore the fact that there has been a cost of living increase, that people in comparable positions in private industry are making more?

This type of bill is not the cause of inflation, it is a necessity as the result of inflation, and as a result of the increase in the cost of living throughout the Nation. I have had some experience in private business prior to my election to Congress, and I have had to face up to the problem of meeting competition and the problem of meeting a weekly payroll. I found you cannot compete in the field of free enterprise with other businesses you have to compete with unless you have to have a better product, a better price. I have found that regardless of how prudent we tried to be we never could meet competition or we could not even stay in business by trying to get labor or people to work for us at a lower wage. On the contrary, we found out the best way of being competitive in the field of free enterprise was to seek to attract the best qualified people to your individual establishments, and the best way to do that is by paying competitive salaries. This has to be true in the Federal Government also. We have 2.5 million on the payroll, with a total payroll of approximately $14 billion.

I am wondering whether we could avoid all of these pay increases in the past. We have heard the same argument every time the pay raise bills have come up for consideration. It is going to throw the budget out of balance, it is stated, and it is going to cause inflation. Does any Member of this body think we could have avoided any of these pay increases in the past? We have to face up to it if we expect to stay in business. We have to pay our employees comparable wages to those in industry, and the only way we can reduce expenditures, reduce the budget, or even balance the budget is to eliminate some of these programs that are costing money, eliminate the programs entirely or reduce the programs. Certainly you cannot reduce the cost by paying inferior wages.

I would like to make one brief observation about Members of Congress, the members of the Cabinet, Federal executives, and so forth in this bill. I recognize that this is a politically difficult question. None of us want to be confronted with the problem of acting on our own particular pay scale. Of course, it is political to act on a pay schedule or raise for Government employees, much less Members of Congress. I do not feel it incumbent upon me to plead the cause of my colleagues, or the cause of Cabinet members. But we should state facts. I do not believe we have to make the salaries of Cabinet members, the judiciary, or Members of Congress competitive with free enterprise.

No one expects that. But I do feel the Federal executives and the members of the judiciary should at least receive a salary somewhat in keeping with the dignity of the office so that they will not have to dig down into their own private savings while they are on the job.

We realize, too, that if we do not raise the salaries of Cabinet members, Members of Congress, and the judiciary, the Congress is going to be extremely reluctant to increase others. Certainly if we fail to increase the salaries of some Federal employees above that now being received by Members of Congress and the judiciary, it will prevent a proper and equitable adjustment throughout the entire salary structure due to the compression caused or created at the top.

As far as I am concerned, the salary adjustment for Congress can be eliminated from the bill. But we should not penalize other Federal employees if we are reluctant to face up to a problem.

I am proud that one of the last official acts I performed as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee was to vote in favor of the bill under consideration which provides upward adjustments in the salaries of all Federal employees. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

The policy which guided our committee in its deliberations was the principle of comparability set forth as congressional policy in Public Law 87-793, approved October 11, 1962.

The term "comparability" simply means that insofar as possible the salaries of Federal employees in all grades and levels should be comparable to the salaries paid for similar work in private industry. The first implementation of such policy is contained in the bill under consideration. This is the reason it provides smaller adjustments for certain categories of employees while providing substantial adjustments in the salaries of other Federal employees.

The Salary Reform Act of 1962 imposes a temporary $20,000 annual salary ceiling at the highest position in the classified and postal salary structure.

It is necessary, therefore, for the Congress to provide adjustments in the salaries of the top executives in our Government in order to release the compression at the top of the Federal employees' salary scale and to carry out the intent of the Congress as expressed in the Federal Salary Reform Act.

The legislation under consideration carries out the foregoing policy by relieving this compression at the top of the Federal employee salary structure and provides necessary adjustments all up and down the line.

Extensive hearings were conducted by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on this subject and the testimony presented dramatically demonstrates the need for this legislation.

A 1963 Civil Service Commission study showed the following comparative salaries:

Over 90 Governors, mayors and city managers, administrative and professional executives, judges, and public corporation officers receive annual salaries exceeding $25,000 per year up to a high of $60,000.

A total of 511 principal administrative officers of colleges and universities and 143 administrators in the Nation's public school systems receive salaries of $20,000 or more per annum.

The pay scales of major foundation and other nonprofit institutions executives range from $20,000 to more than $50,000 per year.

A study of 14 nonprofit contractors handling Federal research and development work revealed that 186 officers, technical directors, and other staff members receive salaries ranging from $23,000 to $45,000 per year.

A total of 120 top officers of the United Natons receive compensation ranging from almost $19,000 to over $25,000 per year.

The President, in his February 1962 message to Congress relevant to salary reform, recognized the inadequacy of existing salary levels for executive positions.

In January 1963, the President established a 12-man advisory panel on Federal salary systems to submit salary recommendations including the appropriate levels for executive salaries. Chairman Clarence B. Randall of the advisory panel submitted its report on June 12, 1963, recommending substantial salary increases for Cabinet members, Supreme Court Justices, Members of Congress, and other high Government officials.

The nonpartistan and highly respected National Civil Service League recently conducted a survey of leaders in the fields of business, education, and other professional pursuits. Approximately 400 persons replied to the questionnaire and indicated that they were impressed with the responsibilities of Government especially in executive positions, and believed that Government salaries should be substantially increased. The most persistent reason given was the compressing effect of the salaries of Cabinet officers on the "second and third echelon" in Government.

I cannot understand why any thoughtful citizen of our great Nation could sincerely oppose these salary increases when they will provide for the retention of the best-qualified Federal employees and serve to attract into the Federal service the most competent high school and college graduates and other well-qualified persons who are interested in Government service as a career.

The "penny wise and pound foolish" arguments of those who oppose pay adjustments for Federal employees do not favorably impress me. Nor do I believe the recent action of the Congress in approving an income tax reduction should be used as an argument against the enactment of this legislation. Each of these measures should be decided on their respective merits and to suggest that because of an income tax cut it is unwise to provide Federal salary increases is to me a ridiculous and absurd conclusion.

The principal problem involved is the fact that over the years the Congress has been somewhat reluctant to face up to the challenge of our modern society and the needs of our Government service in this dynamic period of history.

This legislation has been analyzed in detail by the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], and other Members and I shall not take the time of the Members to repeat the various provisions of the bill. In all likelihood, amendments will be offered which I shall support to provide more realistic adjust-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ments in the salaries of Federal employees in the middle grades, who under the committee bill in my opinion, have been discriminated against.

Some of the opponents of this bill stress the cost of the legislation. I believe that every dollar which is invested in proper salary adjustments for Federal employees will bring back greater returns in the form of increased efficiency by reason of the fact the Government service will attract and retain persons of the highest caliber and with the best qualifications. In other words, I am convinced that funds appropriated for salary adjustments of Federal employees is an investment in the future of America to make certain that our Government is better able to meet the challenge of these times.

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I requested a rule to bring H.R. 8986 to the floor, and have called the bill up under the rule, in view of the substantial majority by which the bill was reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and since the bill, with an amendment which I will offer, has the endorsement of the President and his administration.

H.R. 8986, as reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is noteworthy, in one respect, because its cost of $668 million represents a one-third reduction in the cost that could have resulted had the first bill considered by our committee been reported. The committee is to be commended on this reduction. However, in my judgment, the cost of this legislation is still substantially in excess of an amount which is reasonable and appropriate—in the light of our record peacetime budget and the prospect of continued deficit financing.

Accordingly, as I stated before the Committee on Rules, at an appropriate point in these proceedings I will propose a major amendment in the nature of a substitute for title I of the bill—since title I represents approximately $628 million of the entire cost of the bill. Adoption of my amendment will reduce the annual cost of this title—and, therefore, the cost of the whole bill—by nearly $123 million, bringing the total cost down to approximately $545 million as compared to the President's budget figure of $544 million for the fiscal year 1965.

The reduction in cost will be accomplished by these three major changes in the bill:

First, the amendment will delete new authorizations in the bill for extra benefits for certain groups of employees which were inserted during our committee deliberations although strongly opposed by the administration. One amendment, especially, was adopted on the basis of serious misunderstanding of the cost. Elimination of these overliberal provisions will save an aggregate of $55 million a year.

Second, my amendment will establish, for certain payroll calculations where fractions of cents are involved, a system for rounding out any fraction to the nearest whole cent—in lieu of the present practice of carrying all fractions to the next higher cent. The savings will be $10 million a year.

Third, my amendment will write into the bill an absolute mandate that the departments and agencies shall absorb 10 percent of the increased cost from their 1965 budget as submitted by the President, coupled with a prohibition against the submission of any additional or supplemental request for funds to cover any part of the pay raise. The savings will be approximately $57.8 million. Moreover, this congressional mandate will immeasurably strengthen the hands of the Bureau of the Budget and top management in keeping all departments' and agencies' pay raise costs within the President's budget figure.

I am confident that my amendment is in accordance with, and will materially help in implementing, President Johnson's vigorous program to weed out nonessential Federal jobs. Steps toward this end were initiated by the late President Kennedy immediately after the 1962 Salary Act and are reflected in the budget President Johnson sent to the Congress on January 21, 1964. Regular civilian employment proposed for the executive branch for fiscal year 1965 is down 1,200 from the level at the end of 1964. This is the first budget to call for a reduction in total civilian employment since the practice of making total estimates for the budget proposals began 9 years ago.

Even before the President's budget was finally printed, on December 24, 1963, he wrote each department and agency head that the budget figures would be "ceilings not goals" and added:

> I am still unconvinced that we are getting the maximum possible output per employee. I believe we can do better.

I strongly concur in this statement by the President, and note that he has continued to press vigorously for more economies. On signing the recent tax reduction bill, he pointed out that he was working on budget amendments for 1964 which would reflect cuts in June 1965 employment of approximately 7,500 from the number in his budget. These amendments already have been sent to the Congress and they reflect employment reductions this year as well as next.

President Johnson has ordered regular quarterly reports on management and manpower utilization from the executive branch bureaucracy starting this April 1. He has promised a continued personal review of agency employment needs and employment targets. Clearly, he means business.

The Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission and the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget have assured me that my proposed amendment has the strong endorsement of the President and of his entire administration. I believe it will also receive the general approval of the membership of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], a member of the committee.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] a few moments ago. I was particularly interested to note that he did not cite any figures as to the pay of State officials in his own State of Oklahoma or the State of Iowa. Perhaps it was an oversight on his part that he did not compare the pay of Oklahoma's State officials with the pay of Federal officials under this bill. I would have liked to have heard some figures about the pay of State officials in the State of Oklahoma. Nor am I sure from listening to his presentation whether this bill should be retitled "The hardship bill for Members of Congress" or whether with the $10,000 per year increases it should be titled "The war on poverty bill." I am not quite sure what the correct title of this bill should be in the light of his presentation.

Mr. Chairman, my views and those of some of my colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee are expressed in detail, beginning on page 128 of the report of this legislation, House Report No. 899. It is my earnest hope that the Members of the House will read these minority views on H.R. 8996 before they determine their vote on this measure.

This legislation is premature, unjustified, extravagant, and inequitable. It constitutes an unwarranted raid on the Federal Treasury at a time when American taxpayers are already overburdened. The bill surreptitiously conceals a reckless and unreasonable delegation of power to the President to fix salaries of hundreds of top Government officials, including members of quasi-judicial boards and commissions.

The basic weakness in this legislation is shown by the fact that there is proposed to be offered a series of amendments which will change the basic provisions of the bill. This means, in effect, that an attempt will be made to rewrite the bill on the floor of the House.

This is unacceptable legislative procedure in dealing with a bill as complicated and of such magnitude as this.

The bill was reported by the committee on November 13, 1963, 4 months ago, and conditions have so changed since that time as to require a complete review of this matter.

For example, Congress recently approved a tax reduction measure which will reduce revenues of the Federal Government by billions of dollars annually while at the same time this bill proposes an expenditure of over $650 million annually.

At the time the tax bill was approved, Members of Congress smugly stated they were committed to a program of reducing Federal expenditures whenever and wherever possible. The enactment of this legislation will run contrary to that policy and the policy which has been expressed by the executive branch in cutting Federal expenditures to the bone.

I see little economy in reducing the electric light bill at the White House by

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

$1,000 or $2,000, while endorsing and approving legislation of the nature which is now under consideration.

This penny wise and pound foolish philosophy of the administration will result in a substantial increase in our Federal debt and render useless any sound fiscal policy which the Congress may adopt in the future.

I should like to remind my colleagues that this bill provides greater pay increases for most Federal employees than was provided in a bill approved by our committee in 1962 which was discarded by the House of Representatives in favor of a more modest proposal. At that time, the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], expressed the majority sentiment of the Congress when he referred to the 1962 bill as follows:

> The immoderate cost of this legislation in and of itself is more than sufficient to warrant its disapproval. To proceed further with such a bill, which is destructive of both management needs and essential budgetary considerations, would be the height of fiscal irresponsibility.

This observation applies to the bill under consideration as well as it did to the 1962 bill which was rejected. Also, I should remind my colleagues that less than 2 months ago a substantial pay increase became effective for career Federal employees. The full impact of this pay increase has hardly been felt in our economy and by our Federal employees, but we are now asked to superimpose yet another pay increase. This means that within a period of 18 months, if this bill is enacted, Congress will have approved three pay increases for Federal employees costing $1,650 million annually which former President Kennedy did not favor when he recommended three annual increases beginning in January 1963, so that the full impact of these costs would be absorbed through 3 complete fiscal years.

The proponents of this measure have cited certain cost figures, but they do not include the indirect costs of the bill in terms of fringe benefits and retirement benefits provided therein which will increase the insolvency of the retirement fund which is now some $36 billion in the red.

In addition, it has been estimated that another indirect cost of this legislation will result from an upward adjustment in the payments made to Federal Government contractors and this increase has been conservatively estimated at $250 million annually.

The bill provides increases of $10,000 annually for salaries of Members of Congress. This represents a most untimely and unwarranted increase. I do not believe the rank and file of American people support any such lavish proposal to raise the salaries of Members of Congress at this time. Likewise, the increases provided for Federal judges are extravagant. No one can conscientiously say that the Federal judiciary is treated poorly in terms of lifetime compensation and free retirement benefits.

Some of the ridiculous inequities which are contained in the bill can be illustrated by showing the proposed salary rates for Represen of the H Legislati and the Post ees, exce ing from nually. now rec provides master a the othe Represen

Under the terms of the bill, the Postmaster d will rece Deputy Assi Bureau of over all facilities

With respect to the other four officials of the H nual rat $28,000 least $6,5 the Cler Legislative the Hous under th per annu Director fo at the M ston, Tex the Godd in charg applicati and Spa

It is n officers d But it i compens House of which a pared w for more ment su and tec Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Department of Defense.

A sho provisio in this legislation is the abdication of congressional authority over fixing salar rates for hundreds of top governmental officials who may be paid at the rates of $26,500, $28,000, and $29,500 per annum.

In this bill, individual salary rates are provided for only 61 top executive positions. Salary rates for all other executive positions are at the mercy of the President. These precedent-shattering and illusory provisions have fearful implications.

Even more wantonly reckless is the delegation of authority to the President, under subsections 303 (e), (f), and (g) of this bill, to assign annual salary rates of $26,500, $28,000, or $29,500 to any or all "offices and positions" in Government "which he deems appropriate." This provision, if enacted, will go down in history as "the Presidential punishment or reward section." In other words, a favored official could be rewarded by moving him to a higher pay level, whereas an unfavored official would be punished by relegating him to a lower salary rate.

This ridiculous effort by the administration to have such power delegated to the President violates every reasonable principle, relating to salary fixing based upon duties, responsibilties, internal alinement, or comparability with similar positions in private industry.

There is a more disturbing aspect to these three subsections of the bill. Under these provisions the President is granted permissive authority to fix salaries of Government officials who are described in broad and indefinite terms. For example, under subsection 303(e), "the President is authorized" to pay "Assistant Secretaries of executive and military departments, General Counsels of executive departments, members of regulatory boards and commissions, deputy heads of large agencies, heads of certain agencies and bureaus and such other offices and positions the duties and responsibilities of which he deems appropriate" the annual compensation of $29,500. Subsection 303(f) authorizes the President to pay the "heads of principal services and such other offices and positions the duties and responsibilities of which he deems appropriate" at a salary rate of $28,000 per annum. And finally, under subsection 303(g) the President is authorized to pay the "heads and board members of smaller agencies, deputy heads of other agencies and such other offices and positions the duties and responsibilities of which he deems appropriate" the annual salary of $26,500.

These are vicious provisions, because under their terms the President has almost unlimited authority to raise or to lower the salaries of these top executives at any time without explaining his motives and without regard to any limitation on the number of Government officials so affected.

It should be emphasized that among those positions which the President is given permissive authority to raise or to reduce salaries are members of quasi-judicial boards and commissions where independent judgment free from duress is the backbone of their regulatory processes, policies, and decisions.

More importantly, if these positions are to be pawns in the hands of any Chief Executive, we will have taken a long step backward in our efforts since 1887 to secure justice and objectivity in the decisions of our independent regulatory boards and commissions.

The tremendous power which is proposed to be delegated to the Chief Executive to move up or down the salaries of members of independent boards and commissions could be used to destroy the regulatory processes in Government as we know them today.

This bill should specify with particularity the salaries of members of independent regulatory boards and commissions, so that no President could affect their decisions by intimidation.

If these provisions become law, they will create inequities among Government officials and we predict that the ink will hardly be dry on the signing of this legislation before a rash of bills will be introduced to alter substantially the provisions of this bill relating to the compensation of these top officials.

I suggest you will witness the beginning of this effort today in the form of

five officials of the House of atives which include the Clerk use, the Sergeant at Arms, the e Counsel, the Doorkeeper, and aster. Each of these employees t the Postmaster, is now receiving $20,877 annually to $21,500 annually. The Postmaster of the House ves $18,346 annually. The bill s a salary of $24,500 for the Postnd $28,000 annually for each of four officers of the House of tatives.

the terms of the bill, the Postthe House of Representatives e the same salary as the Deputant Postmaster General, Bureau perations, who has jurisdiction of the post offices and postal n the United States.

spect to the other four officials use of Representatives, the anof pay provided for them of presents a salary increase of at 00 per annum. This means that the Sergeant at Arms, the Legounsel, and the Doorkeeper of of Representatives will receive, provisions of the bill, $3,500 m more than the Assistant Direor Engineering and Development nned Spacecraft Center, Houston, or the Assistant Director of ard Space Flight Center who is of space flight and satellite ns for the National Aeronautics e Administration.

my intention to reflect on these the House of Representatives. ridiculous to provide annual tion for these five officers of the Representatives in the amounts included in the bill when comh other rates of compensation esponsible positions in Governh as top scientific, engineering, nical specialists in the Atomic ommission, National Aeronautics Space Administration, and the nt of Defense.

king and almost unbelievable in this legislation is the abdicongressional authority over fixrates for hundreds of top gov- officials who may be paid at of $26,500, $28,000, and $29,500 m.

bill, individual salary rates are for only 61 top executive posilary rates for all other executions are at the mercy of the These precedent-shattering ry provisions have fearful im-

ore wantonly reckless is the n of authority to the President, bsections 303 (e), (f), and (g) ill, to assign annual salary rates 6,500, $28,000, or $29,500 to any s and positions" in Government e deems appropriate." This if enacted, will go down in histhe Presidential punishment or ction." In other words, a favcial could be rewarded by movo a higher pay level, whereas an l official would be punished by him to a lower salary rate.

llous effort by the administrave such power delegated to the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

proposed amendments to raise salaries of certain favored top administration officials.

Even though this is a Presidential election year, I find it incredible that President Johnson, who has repeatedly called for "frugality" and "economy" in the operation of the Federal Government, would be found supporting this measure. How can the President and the Members of Congress, who recently joined in ramming through an $11.5 billion tax reduction in the face of another staggering treasury deficit, have the audacity to add this pay increase to the debt and deficit?

A substantial part of the tax reduction will have to be financed out of borrowed money and here and now it is proposed to borrow the money to provide Members of Congress and others, particularly those in the top brackets, with unreasonable and unwarranted pay increases. This is not frugality and economy; this is fiscal irresponsibility at its worst.

When the tax reduction bill was brought to the floor of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MILLS] told us, in effect, that in exchange for a cut in taxes Congress must travel the hard road of reduced Government spending. I have not seen much evidence to date that Members of the House have elected to travel that road. Since Mr. MILLS is probably more responsible for the tax reduction bill than any other one Member of the House, I trust he will take the floor on this bill and others that will follow to remind the Members of their responsibility as well as his own to prevent further deficit, debt, and inflation from plunging this Government into insolvency.

Mr. Chairman, in past months we have heard a great deal about sit-in demonstrations in various places across the country. In recent days there has been much talk about whether this bill would be approved without a rollcall vote. I can assure you there will be the demand for a rollcall vote on the question of final passage. Whether there is a record vote will depend upon whether one-fifth or more of those present stand to be counted in favor of a rollcall. I cannot believe Members of the House will stage a sit-in demonstration today or tomorrow and on a voice vote hand themselves a $10,000-a-year pay increase out of borrowed money.

This bill should be defeated, and I urge the House to stand up and be counted on a rollcall vote to reject it.

Let me say to my colleagues that a vote for this measure means the end of any drive for economy. It will be impossible to vote for this bill and keep a straight face in supporting measures that call for reductions in spending.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. In a little while, when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule, I am going to start an economy drive up here by offering an amendment to cut down the salaries of certain employees of the House, to which the gentleman has referred. I want to enlist his aid in that drive.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say in reply that the gentleman's efforts are too late and too little, so far as the gentleman from Iowa is concerned. I say again as I said a little while ago, the floor of the House is no place to rewrite this bill. It ought to have been properly written in the committee of which the gentleman from Arizona is a member.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

(Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation as reported from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and intend to vote for a few amendments which have the support of the majority of our committee members and are deemed appropriate in view of matters which have been developed since our committee favorably reported the bill on November 13, 1963, by a vote of 14 to 6.

As the sponsor of this bill, I most strongly recommend its enactment and earnestly believe that it warrants your support.

This is one of the most important measures in the interest of more efficient and economical Government operations to be considered by this Congress. It is truly a committee bill, worked out after extensive public hearings and exhaustive deliberations in the same spirit of cooperation and compromise that has always marked the work of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on major legislation as to which there are many differences of opinion. I want to extend my most sincere compliments to our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], and to all members of our committee for the diligence, patience, unfailing courtesy, and dedication to the public service they have demonstrated throughout the long and often trying deliberations on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8986 is the test of whether the Congress will abide by its commitment, made in Public Law 87–793, to the "comparability" principle for Federal employees' salaries or discard it within less than 2 years after its adoption. This eminently fair and logical principle of comparability simply means that Federal employees should be paid salaries equal to salaries of their fellow workers in private enterprise who have equal levels of responsibility in their work. It is recognized as the most effective and far-reaching improvement in the Federal salary system since the Classification Act of 1923.

H.R. 8986 is based on the conviction that the Congress will not abdicate its responsibility but, instead, will keep its promise to Federal employees and to the public by maintaining and strengthening the comparability principle.

Title I of the bill will implement Public Law 87–793 by providing the first comparability adjustment subsequent to that act. Public Law 793 helped to bring Government salaries up so as to be comparable to private enterprise salaries as to the 1960–61 period. H.R. 8986 is directed to bringing Federal salaries to a more nearly current basis. The determination of relationships between Federal and private enterprise salaries is, by law, based on annual studies by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which reports the results of its studies to the President, who then in turn makes appropriate recommendations to the Congress.

Since Public Law 793, when enacted in October of 1962, was already some 16 months late, we now face a need to close the gap between 1961 comparability and 1964 comparability. H.R. 8986 would only partly close that gap. This is true because the study upon which it is based is now some 18 months old.

Title I of the bill provides moderate comparability adjustments for classified employees, postal field service employees, and other Federal workers generally covered by salary legislation considered by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The adjustments for employees will be substantially equal as a general proposition, but with some variations in amount and percentage depending upon the salary levels of particular groups of employees. That is to say, for example, a foreign service employee whose salary now is equal to the present salary of a classified or a postal employee will, after enactment of this bill, still receive an equal salary comparable to salaries for equal levels of responsibility in private enterprise.

There is one other major factor which has engaged the special attention of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in setting salary rates, and that is the economic impact of salaries on employees who are paid at differing salary levels.

As I have noted, we are still far behind in achieving comparability with private enterprise salaries on a current basis. Even the enactment of H.R. 8986 will continue a serious time-lag, but not so much as presently exists. This time-lag, or delay in achieving comparability, is especially damaging to postal and other employees in the low-salaried brackets because their incomes leave little or no margin of safety between having the necessaries of life and suffering at least some measure of deprivation or hardship. The delay is less harsh in its impact on higher-salaried employees because they have greater flexibility in disposing their incomes in their every day life.

It is to be emphasized that the treatment of higher-salaried employees in the total comparability picture—that is, Public Law 87–793 and the present bill—is quite fair and even generous, as clearly spelled out in the last paragraph and the chart on page 8 of our committee report. These higher-salaried employees have benefited greatly from adoption of the comparability principle.

It is important to note, also, that our committee bill will cost some $381 million less than the price tag on the bill which we first took up in executive session. In other words, our committee members have given paramount attention, in de-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

veloping this legislation, to budgetary considerations and to the reconciliation of the requirements of a sound and lasting salary policy with the interests of the taxpayers. The cost will be still further reduced, to approximately the $544 contained in the President's budget for the 1965 fiscal year, if the amendment to title I proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] is adopted.

In this connection, the President's remarks at the signing of the tax bill are quite pertinent, and I quote:

I am requesting reports from each independent agency and each Cabinet officer each quarter of the year on how they can reduce employees under the number provided in their budget. I am glad to say to the Congress that within the next few days we will send supplemental estimates that will provide for a reduction, not many jobs but 7,500 under those that we estimated we would need in January when we sent the budget to the Congress, and it will provide reduction in the appropriations that we have requested of $30 million.

This, of course, will further reduce the cost of the bill and bring it well below the President's 1965 budget estimate of $544 million.

Title I of the bill also includes very important reformations, recommended by the Postmaster General, in the system of fixing salaries of postmasters. Postmasters at fourth-class offices will have their pay fixed in proportion to the annual salary rates for PFS level 5, in accordance with the relationship of their hours of duty to full-time service. As to postmasters generally, the bill will discard the archaic system of measuring postmasters' salaries in terms of the dollars of revenue received in their post offices. That system is completely outmoded and will be replaced, under the bill, by a new, realistic, and effective system which balances and gives proper weight to all factors entering into the conduct of post offices and the levels of duties and responsibilities of the postmasters.

Title I guarantees a minimum 3-percent salary increase for postal and other career Federal employees in the lower grades and levels. The average increase for postal employees is 5.6 percent, and the average for classified employees is approximately 4¼ percent.

The maximum dollar increase for the highest grades and levels will be $4,500—representing the difference between the present maximum GS–18 rate of $20,000, and the new rate of $24,500 carried in the bill.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL

Titles II, III, and IV of the bill include increases in the statutory salary levels, ranging from $6,000 to $10,000 for 535 Members of Congress and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; approximately 400 Cabinet and sub-Cabinet offices; 631 Federal judges; and 17 officials each in the legislative and judicial branches. Titles II and IV also include salary adjustments for other legislative and judicial employees, respectively, which are comparable in amount to the increases provided by title I for Classification Act employees. I will comment later on the legislative employees' provisions.

I believe that a table showing these congressional, executive and judicial increases is included, for ready reference, at page 11 of our committee report. As shown by this table, the salaries in our committee bill are from $2,500 to $15,000 below levels recommended by the President's Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems and are also well below the levels contained in H.R. 8716, which represented the views of the administration last year. The following is page 11 of the report:

FEDERAL EXECUTIVES, MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, AND JUDGES

Titles II, III, and IV of the bill include increases in the statutory salary levels, ranging from $6,000 to $10,000, for 535 Members of Congress and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; approximately 400 Cabinet and sub-Cabinet offices; 631 Federal judges; and 17 officials each in the legislative and judicial branches. Titles II and IV also include salary adjustments for other legislative and judicial employees, respectively, which are comparable in amount to the increases provided by title I for Classification Act employees.

No increase is made in the present income tax deduction for living expense of Members of Congress or in the number of trips authorized between Washington and their districts or States, although such increases were recommended by the Randall Panel.

The following table compares certain Federal legislative, executive, and judicial statutory salary rates as they are now, as proposed by the President's advisory panel on Federal salary systems, as recommended by the administration in H.R. 8716, and as provided by the committee bill:

	Present rate	Advisory panel	H.R. 8716	Committee bill
Legislative:				
The Speaker	$35,000	$60,000	$50,500	$45,000
Members of Congress	22,500	[1] 35,000	35,000	32,500
Officers of House:				
Clerk of House	21,500	(1)	30,000	28,000
Sergeant at Arms	21,500	----------	30,000	28,000
Legislative counsel	21,500	----------	30,000	28,000
Doorkeeper	20,877	----------	28,000	28,000
Postmaster	18,316	----------	25,500	24,500
Chief of staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation	21,500	----------	30,000	28,000
Comptroller General of United States	22,500	----------	38,500	32,500
Assistant Comptroller General	20,500	----------	36,500	30,500
Librarian of Congress	20,000	----------	33,000	29,500
The Public Printer	20,000	----------	33,000	29,500
Architect of the Capitol	20,700	----------	33,000	29,500
General Counsel, GAO	20,000	----------	33,000	29,500
Deputy Librarian of Congress	18,500	----------	30,000	28,000
Deputy Public Printer	18,500	----------	30,000	28,000
Assistant Architect of Capitol	19,000	----------	30,000	28,000
Second Assistant Architect of Capitol	17,500	----------	27,500	26,500
Chaplain	9,422	----------	12,500	12,500
Executive:				
Vice President	35,000	60,000	50,500	45,000
Level I—Cabinet	25,000	50,000	40,000	35,000
Level II—Immediate sub-Cabinet	22,500	45,000	38,500	32,500
Level III—Deputy and Under Secretaries, etc	21,000	40,000	36,500	30,500
Level IV—Assistant Secretaries, etc		35,000	33,000	29,500
Level V—Heads of principal services, etc	22,000	33,000	30,000	28,000
Level VI—Heads and board members of smaller agencies, etc	19,000	30,000	27,500	26,500
Judicial:				
Supreme Court:				
Chief Justice	35,500	60,500	50,500	45,500
Associate Justices	35,000	60,000	50,000	45,000
Circuit courts	25,500	45,000	40,500	35,500
Court of Claims	25,500	45,000	40,500	35,000
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	25,500	45,000	40,500	35,000
Court of Military Appeals	25,500	45,000	40,500	35,000
District court [2]	22,500	35,000	35,000	32,500
Customs Court	22,500	35,000	35,000	32,500
Tax Court	22,500	35,000	35,000	32,500
Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts	20,000	----------	35,000	29,500
Deputy Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts	20,000	----------	32,500	28,000
Commissioners, Court of Claims	19,000	26,500	32,500	28,000

[1] Also recommended that $5,000 of Members' salaries be deductible for income tax purposes to offset living expenses; that the number of trips permitted each year between Washington and Members' States or districts be increased substantially; and that salaries of other officers in the legislative branch be increased proportionately to fit them into proper levels of the executive salary structure. H.R. 8986 does not change in any way present provisions of law affecting income tax deductions for Members of Congress or the number of trips they are permitted each year between Washington and their districts or States.

[2] Chief judge, $500 more.

Although less than 1,600 offices and positions are concerned in the congressional, executive, and judicial salary provisions, and the aggregate cost of $15.7 million is but 2.6 percent of the total cost of the bill, these provisions in the judgment of the committee—a judgment strongly supported by recognized authorities on the subject both in Government and private life—are the key to the establishment and maintenance of a sound salary system at every level of the Federal Government. For one thing, the continued application of the comparability principle to salaries of postal and other career Federal employees depends, in the final analysis, on the salary levels of Federal executives, judges, and Members of Congress. The cost of the congressional pay increase amounts approximately to $5,350,000. Each missile that is launched from Cape Kennedy costs more than that, so only one missile, whether success or failure, would take care of this congressional increase. It is less than 1 percent of the cost of the entire bill.

But early adoption of the proposed salary rates for these high offices is of even more consequence than flows from their impact on general Government salary levels. Members of Congress—the 100 Senators, the 435 Representatives in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner—in a sense sit as a board of directors for the world's biggest busi-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ness—the Government of the United States. Each and every one of them is the lawfully elected representative of citizens ranging in number from 180,000 in the smallest district to 18 million in the largest State. Together, they bring to bear the full force and effect of the views and interests of 190 million Americans on the policies, programs, and operations of their Government.

By comparison a Federal-private enterprise executive salary comparison borders on the absurd. A recent sampling of 1,157 private enterprise manufacturing corporations disclosed a median salary figure of $91,000 for the highest paid officer. But setting that aside, Federal executive, congressional, and judicial salaries have been permitted to fall far below even those paid in many State and municipal governments. A Federal Cabinet officer, heading one of the 10 great departments that are so vital to national safety and welfare, now receives $25,000 a year. The State of California alone has 135 governmental positions which pay more than $25,000 a year. Pennsylvania has 165, Illinois has 92, and New York has 432. The Governor of New York receives $50,000 plus the use of an executive mansion. The mayor of New York City receives $50,000. Los Angeles pays the general manager of its water and power departments over $40,000. Florida pays the director of a trade exposition $50,000. The general manager of the Boston Transit Authority receives $40,000, and the superintendent of Chicago schools is paid $48,500.

In the field of education—so long the subject of concern at the dearth of good teachers and educators due to low salaries—we find 81 college presidents being paid more than $25,000. The principal full-time officers of 17 charitable foundations receive over $35,000.

Similarly, the 400 Executive Salary Act positions in the bill are those of the 10 Cabinet posts—the highest appointive offices within the public domain, and the President's closest advisers in guiding our national destiny—their immediate sub-Cabinet associates and aids, and their chief management and administrative assistants. These are the few high offices charged with the duty and trust of advising the President and the Congress for the advancement of the national interest and of carrying out, under the direction of the President and subject to the laws of the Congress, our great defense and other essential programs. Upon their wisdom and judgment, their foresight and ability, their dedication and skill, depend the peace and the prosperity and the well-being—indeed, the very existence—of the United States. The men and women who hold these offices have imposed on them the incalculable weight of responsibility for the protection and the advancement of all of the vast interests and affairs, both internal and among nations, of the 190 million Americans they serve.

In titles II and IV of the bill we have followed our historic policy of providing salary adjustments for legislative and judicial employees which are comparable to the adjustments granted to classified employees. This was done in the 1955, 1958, and 1960 salary bills, and in our committee bill in 1962 which was not acted on. In 1962, the bill written in the other body granted only a single phase adjustment for legislative employees—effective in October 1962—whereas the 1.6 million other employees received the 1962 raise as the first phase under Public Law 87-793 and, in addition, have now received a second-phase raise effective last January, under the same law. Our committee bill is intended to restore parity in these salaries for the executive, legislative, and judicial branch employees.

However, with respect to legislative employees, the considerable lapse of time since the committee reported the bill, the interposition of the second-phase salary adjustment for classified employees last January, and the additional increase provided by the committee bill for the first five classified grades require a change in technical language to carry out the committee's intention. Without this change, the customary and desirable internal alinement of congressional employees' salaries would be distorted. I understand a proper amendment will be offered to take care of this.

As pointed out in our committee report, full comparability with private enterprise salaries is impractical for the highest Government offices. But present Federal salaries at top levels are so absurdly low as to be grossly unfair and burdensome, and seriously impede efficient management and effective direction of the public business.

Comparability with private enterprise pay levels for our great Federal career services, on the other hand, is not only practical but is commonsense economy in the interest of the taxpayers. This is demonstrated by the history of salary legislation between 1945 and the adoption by Congress of the comparability principle in 1962. Pay raise legislation before 1962 was on the shotgun basis, influenced more by pressures and emotional factors than by any systematic or realistic consideration of Government requirements and proper salary levels.

The seven across-the-board pay raises beginning with the 1945 salary act and ending with the 1960 act averaged out to a 4.9-percent pay raise each year for the approximately 1.5 million classified and postal employees. Had the comparability policy been in effect, the raises would have averaged more nearly 3 percent.

The points I have noted are those which I believe to be of paramount importance and concern so that the membership of the House may be fully informed as to the principles of our committee bill and of the necessity for its early enactment. I hope that this worthy legislation will receive approval of the House of Representatives.

In other words, the proposed increase of $10,000 per year in congressional salaries is only 1 percent or a little less than 1 percent of the entire cost of this bill. Every time a missile is launched at Cape Kennedy, whether it is a success or not, it costs more than the total amount of the salary increases for Congressmen, Members of the Senate and the House for the year. In other words, say 20 missiles launched in future months, the cost of those 20 missiles would pay this congressional salary increase for the next 20 years.

I certainly urge my fellow Members to support this bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER], a member of the committee.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8986. As one who introduced an identical bill it is obvious that I am and always have been in favor of a bill of this kind. I believe that as Members of this great body we have a very heavy responsibility and I believe we should meet it.

We are in the position of a board of directors approving management recommendations; therefore, we have in our hands the economic fate of about 1¾ million persons. I do not believe we should evade this responsibility. We should meet it because many of us know that, especially in the lower classes, our employees are forced to take secondary jobs or have their wives working, thereby taking the jobs of others, in order to maintain their status of life, and to meet their responsibility in the neighborhoods in which they must live. Therefore, I say that if we are to do that which is right and especially since we claim to be the greatest country on the face of this earth, we must pay our Federal employees a fair and just salary for a fair and just day's work.

I will not go through all of the reasoning behind this bill. You have heard it explained technically. You know it has the idea of comparability in it. You know the Bureau of Labor Statistics is going to make a survey every year and report to the President, and the President is required to come before the Congress and tell us what the differential is. This was all taken care of in the Salary Reform Act of 1962, and I do not believe it is necessary for us to go into this question and be repetitive, but I should like to remind you what President Johnson said in his budget message to the Congress about this very pay legislation. He said:

> Although this budget is deliberately restrictive, I have concluded that Government economy will best be served by an upward adjustment in salaries.

He continued,

> This budget provides for the cost of such action in this session of Congress. Any pay action by Congress should bring salary rates for top executive branch positions up to levels more nearly commensurate with their respective responsibilities.

I thoroughly agree with the President's fine words. I believe there is ample justification for paying top management salaries to top management people. Of course, we can always get men and women to run for Congress, there is no question about that. What we want is to get the best men and women to run, and when they are here to let them live according to the standards by which they should live.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

I call your attention to the fact there have been only four increases in congressional salaries since 1866, and none since 1955. Therefore, I think Members of the Congress are justified in going before the taxpayers of this country and asking for a salary which is commensurate with their responsibilities which, as you know and I know, are quite grave.

I would like to pay tribute to the reporters for the local newspapers in this area. It seems to me that we are particularly blessed by having men like Jerry Klutz of the Washington Post, Joseph Young of the Evening Star, and John Cramer of the News, who clarify Federal employee matters before us and before the Federal employees.

I should like also to point out particularly that one of the amendments the chairman of our committee, the Honorable TOM MURRAY, will introduce, is directly a result of a suggestion by one of these fine reporters.

I think it is almost unique in the annals of journalism that a newspaperman, through the agency of just one story, has saved the American taxpayers $10 million annually. That newspaperman is John Cramer, the Federal reporter for the Washington Daily News.

In a column ostensibly addressed to the President of the United States, Mr. Cramer suggested that in writing the pay bill now before the House, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service should amend current law to provide for the computation of rates of pay in full cents, by rounding off the fractions to the nearest penny. This seemingly simple idea has evidently never occurred to anyone in Government before. This suggestion is carried out in one of the amendments we will be considering. The best informed experts say that the adoption of this amendment will save the taxpayer a minimum of $10 million a year and perphaps more, without hurting a single Federal employee.

I congratulate Mr. Cramer for his intelligence and his concern for the national economy. Surely an achievement as great as this is deserving of appropriate notice and attention.

When we get back into the House, Mr. Chairman, I propose to ask unanimous consent to include this story with my remarks.

The story is as follows:

IDEA FOR L.B.J.: HOW TO SAVE $16 MILLION

(By John Cramer)

I have a Government economy suggestion for President Johnson—about 16 or 17 million bucks worth—a case of mills becoming millions.

The idea comes from a State Department employee, who prefers to remain anonymous, but asked me to relay it.

Anyway, Mr. President, there's roughly $16 to $17 million of what might be called "windfall money" in the pending Federal employee pay raise bill.

And if you put that famous presidential arm on the right Members of Congress, the windfall can be eliminated before the bill eventually comes to you for signature—and precedent can be established for similar savings on future bills.

NO INJUSTICE

Moreover, this can be done with perfect equity to all Federal employees, and injustice to none.

Here's the pitch:

The pay bill provides raises for 1.6 million postal, classified (white collar), and related Federal employees—increases intended as another step toward lifting their rates to a level "reasonably comparable" with national average private enterprise rates.

Under the "comparability" formula, the annual rates of Government workers eventually will match the average annual rates of private employees.

But the truth is, Mr. President, that virtually all Federal employees are paid more than the annual rates spelled out in their salary schedules.

That's true of present scales.

It also will be true if the pending bill is enacted in its present form.

DIVISION

Let my State Department idea man explain. He wrote:

"The original pay rates in the Federal service were established as figures that were divisible by the 24 pay periods in a year. When the number of pay periods was increased to 26, the rates were not exactly divisible by 26.

"Finally legislation was passed, and continues in the pending pay bill, which provides that 'an hourly rate shall be established by dividing the annual rate by 2,080' and 'All rates shall be computed in full cents, counting a fraction of a cent as the next higher cent.'

"The effect of this provision is to raise the salaries actually paid above the statutory annual rate. For example, the annual rate for the first step of GS–6 is $5,035, but the formula raises it to $5,054.70. For GS–7, the statutory rate is $5,540, the formula rate $553.60.

IN FRACTIONS

"My proposal is to amend the pay bill to provide that all rates shall be computed in full cents, with fractions of cents being rounded to the nearest full cent."

"In practice, this would limit to $10.40 the amount that could be paid in excess of the annual rate in any given case. The amount less than the annual rate which could be paid would be $10.39."

Now, Mr. President, let's look at the savings.

Should the pay bill be revised in the manner proposed, roughly half of all Federal employees would find their hourly rate adjusted downward to the next lower penny—rather than upward to the next higher.

They temporarily would lose a cent-an-hour—$20.80 per year.

But later, as they moved up their within-grade pay steps, they would recover this penny-an-hour for a time * * * lose it * * * recover it again. And at the end of their Federal careers, their total earnings inevitably would balance out at something very, very close to a true annual "comparability" base.

I divide 1.6 million Federal employees by one-half, multiply by $20.80, and come up with an annual saving of $16,640,000.

As it happens, Mr. President, I think the "comparability" principle makes all the sense in the world. But I don't think Federal employees are entitled to $16,640,000 per year more than "comparability."

I would like to take just a moment to answer one of the criticisms made by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot share the alarm that has been expressed over the section of this bill which establishes six levels of Federal salary schedules and which gives authority to the President to place certain positions in levels IV, V, and VI.

Let us look carefully at these provisions of H.R. 8986 which are giving cause for undue alarm and let us see exactly what is proposed.

In my opinion, the creation of a six-level salary schedule in which would be placed the approximately 400 top Federal executives is just as enlightened and progressive a step forward in good personnel management as was the enactment of the Classification Act in 1923. What does it do? It replaces the present hodgepodge of 14 different salary levels for these top officials which have grown up like Topsy over the years to the point where they have almost become unmanageable and certainly unwieldy and cumbersome.

In the first three levels of the executive salary schedule positions are specifically placed by title. For example, all cabinet officers are placed in level I; certain Deputy and Under Secretaries generally in level II. Other Deputies and Secretaries in level III.

Now listen to this. Section 303(d) then gives the President or authorizes him to place certain other officers and positions in levels IV, V, and VI, in accordance with guidelines and criteria that have been established. Now this is the section against which criticism has been leveled. I ask: What is so very fearful and so ominous about delegating authority to the President of the United States to place certain executive positions in these levels? Is not this the same kind of authority that you or I would give any executive of any private corporation? Is it not standard practice in private industry? Can anyone give any credence to the allegations that may be made or that have been made that any President of the United States would abuse this authority? Do we not give him a great share of responsibility for our national security? Does he not have the responsibility of our domestic welfare in his hands? Should we not give him some right to move various positions around according to his best judgment so that there will be no conflict between heads of various departments? Certainly, this is good management, and to me it seems as though it would be right and I, for one, have no fear whatsoever of any President of these United States abusing this authority. I say that we should not be concerned about this.

In closing, I would like to say that we are all for economy. Every Congress of the United States is apparently for economy. The appropriation committees are always trying to reduce the budget. But I say that if we are going to use a surgeon's scapel approach—do not let us take it out of the hides of the men and women who are producing fine government for the citizens of the United States of America.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to say to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER] who is now addressing us that his departure from the Congress will be a loss to the Congress and to the Nation as well. When we on this side of the aisle learned of the gentle-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

man's plans for retirement we felt as badly and downhearted I am sure as the gentleman's colleagues on his own side of the aisle. We all have the greatest admiration and the highest respect for our distinguished colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman on the fine speech he is making in regard to this bill.

While I support most of the provisions of H.R. 8986, I oppose title II, the portion of this legislation which affords Members of Congress an immediate and substantial increase in salary.

At the very least, the congressional pay raise should not become effective until the next Congress has been elected and convened. We all know what the pay was when we ran for the 88th Congress. Our election amounts to a contract with the people we represent, to serve them for the duration of this Congress, in accordance with the terms of employment existing when we took oath of office.

There is another reason for considering adoption of title II to be untimely. We have but recently voted a very substantial reduction in Federal taxes. At the time the Federal tax bill passed the House, those of us who supported that legislation pledged ourselves to redoubled efforts to effect economies in the national budget.

How can we be consistent with that pledge if we now vote ourselves a large pay increase? Should we not rather, exercise restraint in voting major benefits to ourselves at this time.

Is it not incumbent upon us to exhibit personal leadership for economy in Government by declining this raise?

Now I for one would like a pay raise as well as the next fellow. No doubt my creditors would be overjoyed to learn I had received one. But under the circumstances existing today, I must oppose title II.

I support title I of the bill which raises the salary scales for post office and civil service employees. I do so for two main reasons. First because the raises originally proposed by the committee have been reduced until the overall cost of the bill is within the budget recommendations made by President Johnson for this purpose. Second, because the pay raises contained in title I are designed to bring Federal salaries in classified employment, in line with the principle of "comparability," accordance with legislation which was adopted, with my support, by the 87th Congress. Thus the Federal Government will be paying its employees at a level equal to that earned in private industry for work requiring similar loads of responsibility and degree of skill.

(Mr. STAFFORD asked and was given permission to revise and extended his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the Chairman allowing me this time to speak on H.R. 8986.

As you all know, I have been a very strong supporter of adequate salaries for our dedicated employees—both our postal employees and the rank-and-file employees of the Federal Government.

Salary increases are to be provided for the employees under title I of H.R. 8986. I supported those increases in our committee deliberations, and I support them today. However, I have some reservations about some of the generous increases to be provided in other portions of the bill.

It is my understanding that at a later time our distinguished chairman [Mr. MURRAY] will offer an amendment. In part this amendment will strike out a section which was adopted in our committee.

The amendment adopted in the committee is nothing more than a formula of providing the postal workers with full credit for full-time work in the computation of their salary levels. This amendment is in conformity with the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962.

Mr. Chairman, Public Law 87–793, known as the Pay Reform Act of 1962, sought to establish for future application the principles of "equal pay for substantially equal work" and "pay comparability with similar work in private industry." Unfortunately, the implementation of Public Law 87–793 created many inequitable pay situations. These resulted primarily because the imposition of an arbitrary cutoff date of October 13, 1962, thereby depriving many postal employees of full and proper credits for their postal service.

As a result, postal employees in the first four levels who had not progressed beyond step 5 retained their anniversary dates for step increases. In many instances, such employees received an additional step increase within weeks or months after the enactment of Public Law 87–793. On the other hand, employees in the first four levels in step 6 or above, and employees who had already earned longevity step increases, did not retain their anniversary dates and were compelled to start new periods toward their next step increases.

We are hopeful that the following examples, which I shall give, will clarify the detrimental and inequitable effects on postal employees with many years of service.

As an example, a level 4 employee who entered the postal service on October 1, 1956, was placed in step 8 on October 13, 1962, at an annual wage of $5,685. An employee in the same level who entered the postal service 2 weeks later, on October 15, 1956, was placed in step 7 and received an annual wage of $5,525. The latter employee will be required to serve 3 years in step 7 before going to step 8, thus earning $160 per annum less than the first employee. For the next five step increases over a period of 15 years the employee who entered the service only 2 weeks later will be out of pocket at least $2,400.

Let me give another illustration of this inequity.

An employee who entered the postal service on October 1, 1950, was placed in step 9 at $5,845 per annum. An employee who entered October 15, 1950, 2 weeks later, was placed in step 8 at $5,685.

An employee who went into the postal service on October 1, 1945, was placed in step 10 at $6,005 per annum. An employee who entered 2 weeks later, on October 15, 1945, was placed in step 9 at $5,845 per annum, the identical salary of the employee who entered almost 5 years later on October 1, 1950.

It is my hope that my amendment that was adopted in committee be retained in the bill.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 8986, which will provide a much needed and richly deserved increase in pay to our postal workers and other Federal employees. In addition, I am definitely in favor of the Dulski amendments, and certainly hope that such amendments are retained in the bill as passed by this House.

I have supported pay raise legislation for employees of our Federal Government in the past, and it appears to me that in enacting such legislation the Congress is continuing to assume its rightful responsibilities in maintaining fair and adequate salary schedules for its civil servants. Several years ago we passed the Federal Salary Reform Act, and once again today we have the opportunity to update the provisions of that act and to bring the salaries of our Federal workers more in line with the salaries paid in private industry for comparable work. We are all well aware of the fact that in private industry pay increases are given somewhat automatically in line with the rise in the cost of living, improved production, longevity, or in accordance with contracts which have been negotiated between labor and management, and which take all these factors into consideration. Our Federal employees must rely on the consideration and generosity of the Congress to adjust salaries, and for the most part these have been in the past rather inadequate compromises which have kept the Federal pay scale lagging behind similar scales in private industry.

In order to attract employees to the field of Government service, we must offer benefits which are at least comparable to those in private industry, and although the salary is not the sole factor to be considered, it is most certainly the most important one. We must maintain our productivity, and at the same time set an example for private industry in the field of personnel relations.

I am particularly aware of the conditions affecting our postal workers in the New York City area. They work long

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

hours, at hard work, and it has been amply demonstrated during the recent hearings on this legislation that they fall far behind the pay scales of employees performing comparable work in the field of private enterprise. It is becoming increasingly difficult to attract and retain these employees in the Post Office Department because of the pay and the unfavorable working conditions. Those who would honestly like to make a career in the postal service find that they cannot do so because of insufficient compensation with which to support themselves and their families. If they do remain with the Department, they are forced to seek additional employment in order to meet the continued high cost of living; or, in the alternative, the wife must leave home and seek work in order to supplement the family income. This certainly does not create a healthy and harmonious atmosphere in the home, especially where there are children. The same situations, of course, face many of our employees in other branches of the Fedral service. It is up to us to rectify these conditions.

Too often our Government employees are held up to ridicule and contempt, and accused of incompetence and slothfulness. Because one apple in the barrel turns out to be rotten, too many of our citizens are ready to hand down a blanket indictment of all civil servants. In my opinion, too much cannot be said on the credit side, about their loyalty, their devotion, their dedication to duty, and their capacity for work, in many instances under conditions which leave much to be desired. I hope that my colleagues will see their way clear today to bring about the enactment of this bill which will, in some small measure, let our Federal workers know that their efforts are appreciated and acknowledged.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] such time as he may desire.

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the section of H.R. 8986 which increases the pay of the Members of Congress to $32,500.

As for myself, I knew what the pay was when I ran for election, and I cannot break faith with the people who elected me to this office.

I am very much in favor of the raises for postal employees and other employees in the Federal Government. They deserve this increase.

The congressional pay increase should be eliminated; and, if it is not, then I must vote against the bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the committee [Mr. JOHANSEN], 10 minutes.

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8986—the Federal pay bill.

I voted against this bill in committee. I joined in signing the minority views, which I urge my colleagues to read starting on page 128 of the committee report. I voted against the rule.

I favor a straight recommittal motion to enable the committee to eliminate or correct the many grave defects in this bill and to modify its provisions in the light of the recently voted $11.5 billion tax cut.

I do not believe a motion to recommit with instructions—which, I understand, will be offered—can accomplish these urgently needed corrections.

Since a straight recommittal motion is thus precluded, I shall vote against the bill, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise. I hope this vote on final passage will be by rollcall.

I proceed immediately to the major reasons for my opposition to this legislation.

First. This bill, and the claims made in its behalf, constitute a fraud on this House and on the American taxpayers.

Two key words figure prominently in the arguments of proponents of this bill—economy and comparability.

Both words are used fraudulently.

Of course, we now have an Orwellian black-is-white, up-is-down, revised definition of economy.

By this revised definition, economy is a saving which ends up leaving the taxpayer paying more, net.

This bill is full of that kind of economy.

Consider, for example, the self-righteously boastful claim made on page 3 of the majority report. The report claims that the salary schedules proposed in this legislation—as voted out of committee last November 13—involve "a reduction of $381 million below the $981.8 million cost which would have been incurred had the proposal first taken up by the committee for action been adopted."

And then the majority report smugly adds:

> This is the greatest proportionate reduction in a major Federal salary increase measure that has ever been made by the committee.

This boastful statement—designed to create an impression of a heroic and successful committee effort to reduce expenditures—is a perfect example of the new version of economy. It is a saving which ends up costing the taxpayer more; a great deal more, I will add, heaped on top of two other recent and very expensive economy efforts of exactly the same sort.

Talk about glorying in one's shame.

When this $981 million "first proposal" was "taken up by the committee for action"—I am using the majority report's exact words—we were just 10 months removed from prior enactment of a two step $1 billion pay boost—and the second phase of this pay increase was still nearly 5 months in the future.

I would think that the majority of the committee—who took up this $981 million first proposal in August of last year—would be happy just to forget that they even considered such a second billion dollar folly.

But no—they drag it out in order to congratulate themselves on their record-breaking economy accomplishments.

Today we are having another display of economy heroics. Under the amendment offered—or to be offered—by our distinguished chairman the price tag of this bill is being cut back to $545,700,000. More economy of the same kind—another saving that ends up as a new, added cost to the taxpayer. I am not just sure how much more such economy the American taxpayer can endure and survive.

But before you let yourself get caught up in the economy fervor being promoted here today, may I remind you that if this bill—even with the Murray amendment—becomes law, the Congress will have voted a billion and one-half dollars in additional Federal payroll costs in about 18 months.

And you will have completed this remarkable demonstration of economy on the heels of a $11.5 billion tax cut which, while cutting Federal revenues, provides a fourth increase in the take-home pay of Federal employees in 21 months.

Now there is another reason why I would have thought the authors of the majority report would have preferred to have forgotten about the $981.8 million pay bill "proposal first taken up by the committee for action."

This brings me to the comparability fraud involved in this legislation and in the arguments offered in its support.

The majority report states that the purpose of this legislation is "to comply with the mandate, laid down by the Congress in Public Law 87-793, that postal and other Federal career employees shall be paid salaries comparable to salaries paid their fellow workers in private enterprise for comparable levels of responsibility, skill, and performance."

The report further claims that in this bill "the comparability principle has been applied to the career employees' salary adjustments to the maximum practical extent."

All of this raises some very pertinent questions:

The first proposal "taken up by the committee for action"—by the report's own admission, or boast—cost $381 million more than the amount finally voted out by the majority of the committee. Does this mean that the bill voted out is $381 million short of a genuine application of the comparability principle? If so, then the claim that there is a "prospective saving under the comparability principle of approximately $175 million a year," a claim based on the pay increase actually voted out, is a proven phony.

On the other hand, if the proposal first "taken up by the committee for action" was actually $381 million—or any substantial portion of this figure—in excess of the true cost of applying comparability, why was it ever proposed for consideration by the committee?

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Is comparability so vague and ill-defined a standard and measuring-stick that it can involve a 50 percent factor of error—a 50 percent overshot?

If the total cost of the originally proposed pay schedules was reduced because it was an error, an overshot, why doesn't the majority report frankly say so—and take the credit it is entitled to for correcting this error?

Instead, the majority report attributes the reduction to budgetary considerations. If this was the case why doesn't the majority report admit that under budget restrictions it had to fall this far short of comparability and give some indication as to when and how it is going to catch up on this gap while also keeping pace with subsequent annual increases in the pay scales of private enterprise?

Or is the simple truth that despite the much-touted comparability principle the old rule of asking for "all the traffic will bear" still prevails? Evidently my colleague from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] thinks so since he calls this bill a compromise—and I thought comparability was a really objective yardstick.

At the very least, comparability must be a very elastic concept.

I suspect that it is, in reality, a pious fraud.

Second. This bill is dangerous because it in effect ratifies—or, if you please, re-ratifies—the dubious principle of comparability.

Let us read what the majority report says on this very point:

> H.R. 8986 represents the first—and undoubtedly the conclusive—test as to whether the Congress intends to abide by its commitment to the comparability principle or discard it within a year after its adoption.

Well, if the action on this bill is to be, as the majority report implies, the "conclusive test" as to whether Congress is to be permanently committed to this comparability principle, I suggest that we had better take a hard, last-chance, second look at the matter.

We are, in effect, at the end of the probationary period for this scheme. Before we make it an established fixture of Federal pay policy, let us carefully review the question.

Especially, since it is already requiring a $1½ billion increase in payroll costs to get the program airborne—if, indeed, it is actually airborne.

Especially, since proponents of this principle claim that average pay increases for Federal employees for the past 15 years has been 4.9 percent for each year while, in fact, during the 2 years of the operation of the comparability principle, Congress will have provided—with adoption of this bill—more than 5 percent a year average increase for most Federal employees.

Especially, since the Budget Director and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission have accepted a 3-percent-a-year increase as the minimum likely increase in wages in the private economy as the frame of reference for annual pay increases for Federal employees under the comparability principle. There is no assurance that this 3 percent will be the ceiling for such annual increases. In fact, I think you can safely bet that it will not be. Moreover, these officials predict that the executive pay schedules will have to be cranked up higher every 6, 7, or 8 years because of compression created by these built-in annual pay boosts at the lower levels.

Consider also that Bureau of Labor Statistics reports show that the cost-of-living index has risen 7.5 percent since December 1957, while in the same period Classification Act employees have received an average of 23.2 percent pay increase plus 4.1 percent which went into effect January 1 of this year. Obviously, cost of living goes into the ashcan as a factor in determining Federal pay increases if we go whole hog on the comparability kick.

I repeat the warning I voiced in October 1962, when the House voted to adopt this principle. It ties Federal pay raises into the strike-induced or strike-threat-induced pay raises of private collective bargaining, and it also gears Federal pay raises to the pay scales of the cost-plus contract system of Government contractors who find it easy to capitulate to wage increase demands in their tax-subsidized competition for personnel.

Perhaps comparability is a commitment, a promise.

However, a bad promise, I submit, is sometimes better broken.

Third. This pay bill involves an unprecedented and unconscionable grant of power to the President—power to punish and reward.

It abdicates to the Executive the authority, previously retained by Congress, to fix the salary rates in the $26,500, $28,000, and $29,500 brackets for hundreds of top Government officials.

Worse than that, it also provides that in addition to specifically identified categories of offices and positions which the President may thus assign to these salary brackets his authority extends to "such other offices and positions the duties and responsibilities of which he deems appropriate for this level."

Worst of all, this discretionary authority to promote or demote—salarywise—extends to "members of regulatory boards and commissions" which can make a mockery of the independent agency status of these boards and commissions.

Surely I do not need to elaborate on the potent and potential evils and abuses inherent in such a grant of power to the Executive.

Fourth. The $10,000 a year pay increase for Members of Congress—and top Executive Pay Act officials—is a bonus for profligacy if not bankruptcy and an affront to the American taxpayer.

We have a $310 billion national debt, with a forecast of a $317 billion total by June 30, 1965. We have a $10.7 billion deficit for the current year, with a $5 billion deficit next fiscal year a certainty and a $10 billion deficit a possibility.

We have a credit card tax cut of $11.5 billion—and, I might add, the proposed beneficiaries of the $10,000 a year pay raise benefit also, and substantially, from this tax cut in terms of added take-home pay.

True there are Members—younger Members with families—who have financial problems. But I know of no pay systems generally prevalent in private enterprise which are geared to the size of the employee's family. I do not think we can use this argument for pay increases for Congressmen with good grace.

True the annual cost of the congressional pay increase of $10,000 is as its advocates are so fond of emphasizing—"only" $5,360,000. True this is a small fraction of the aggregate pay raise costs in this bill and in the pay bills enacted since the last congressional pay increase in 1955.

But bear in mind that the congressional and top Executive Pay Act increases pull the plug on pay increase demands all the way down the line of the classified pay system. It is literally a "lid raising operation" as I said on the House floor during debate in October 1962, on the last pay bill.

Who is to set an example of restraint, of prudence, of salaries geared to performance, if not the public servants in these highest salary categories and—above all—Members of Congress?

I suggest that there is a price, in terms of the loss of confidence, faith and respect of the American people, in and for the Congress of the United States and its Members, which we cannot afford to pay to gain only $5,360,000 in agreegate salary increases. This is a price, indeed, which cannot be measured in dollars.

I have read news reports of a $100-a-plate dinner to be held here in Washington tomorrow evening. It is suggested that because of the makeup of the guest list passage of this pay bill will "give the celebrants something extra to cheer."

This may prove to be the case. If so it will not be prudence or sound economy or fiscal responsibility that will be applauded.

I could not help recalling a message writ large on the walls of another and ancient banquet hall—in another and ancient Babylon:

> Thou art weighed in the balances and found wanting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] if he will yield me 5 additional minutes?

Mr. CORBETT. I am very, very sorry.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Let me say to the gentleman that I assure the Members of House they will hear the rest of what I have to say later.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in explanation of our committee's activities regarding the comparability principle. The principle is based on the fact that the Federal service must compete for skilled employees with the private economy—the lawyers, the electricians, the scientists, the economists—

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

the high skilled and the low skilled. Our Government employees must be as skilled as the employees in the private economy. This is a must for the sound operation of such a wonderful Government as we have.

On this principle of paying wages to Federal employees comparable with those paid in the private economy, we had hearings that lasted 10 days and spread over 2 months. Not a single witness appeared against the principle. Numerous leaders in private industry and numerous experts in matters of the economy supplied statements in support of comparability.

Now then, how did we study this matter? First, we consulted the Bureau of Labor Statistics who provided us with comparability surveys. For the most part, we found that classified workers in grade 5 and postal employees in level 4 were 5 to 6 percent behind the private economy; and the surveys were at least 2 years old. So there is a timelag in even our recommendations. If we extended or projected the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures to the present, we would probably have to be paying an increase of 9 percent to these levels. So you see, first we compromised in our comparison between the Federal employee and the skilled private worker by often not grading the Federal employees with the same identical skills as the private employees.

For example, letter carriers are barely being equated with common laborers, when really they should be equated with skilled craftsmen in the private economy. On top of that compromise we have the time lag in our statistics. For this reason, our bill comes out $300 million less than our original estimate of what the price of increasing pay for Federal employees was calculated to be. The other factor that I think should be pointed out is that since 1955, there have been a number of pay increases which have given a 55-percent overall increase to all the grades and levels up to 15 or 16. The remaining Federal employees in grades through 18 and those who are in the executive, judicial, and legislative positions have received no increases. We do not propose that these higher scaled people be paid comparably to the same skills in the private economy. To do so would be extremely difficult and a great deal more expensive. For example, the Secretary of Defense left a position paying $400,000 a year in private industry to take a position paying only $25,000 a year. With our bill, we would only raise him to $35,000. Thus, what we are really doing is facing the fact that the higher paid executive, judicial, and legislative positions have become a ceiling for the classified employees' pay in the higher classifications. The skilled scientist and the skilled lawyer or economist just cannot be offered more than $20,000 under the present system. We cannot be providing higher salaries for employees than their superiors and administrators. There is not a chance of raising them until their superiors in the executive, legislative, and judicial positions are raised. Then, raising these, we must have some comparison between the Cabinet, the judiciary, and the Congress. I think it is a reasonable comparison that we have made, and that it is a good bill. It is necessary if we are to keep our country strong by attracting the highly skilled people needed to carry on the many complex functions of Government.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I first want to express my thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] for giving me this time, although I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss with the committee an amendment which I will offer when the proper time comes, an amendment which is a very simple one. It is embodied in a bill which I have introduced in the House, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations. It contains a very simple proposition, namely, that the accounts of the committees of this House and of the Architect of the Capitol be subject to the audit of the General Accounting Office, not by request, as the law now reads, but by requirement.

Presently the legislative branch is outside the consideration of the law that the General Accounting Office should audit its accounts. My amendment would merely require that the accounts of our committees and of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol be subject to such audit, and that those audits be printed as House documents, similar to those of other departments.

Mr. Chairman, considering the amounts that we in the House are now spending for the operation of the Congress and considering the criticisms, rightful or wrongful, which have been directed at the Congress, in my opinion mainly because of a lack of understanding and because of a lack of opportunity to give sufficient attention to these operations, I do not see how we in this House can take a position that we should not be accountable in detail for the funds which we spend in order to carry out our legislative function.

The chairman of the Committee on Government Operations was kind enough to request comments regarding this legislation, which I presented, from the General Accounting Office, from the Committee on House Administration, and from the Architect of the Capitol. The former two seemed to favor it, the latter objected. At an appropriate time in these proceedings I will ask permission of the House that these replies to the committee be inserted in the RECORD. However, it is my understanding at this point that the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, whom I should like to thank for his courtesy to me, has not scheduled or at least has given me no intention of scheduling hearings on this measure. That is why I have felt forced to take this opportunity and this method of bringing the matter up for the consideration of the House.

I sincerely hope the committee will give this amendment its serious consideration. Even though on the surface it may appear not only simple but unmeaningful to many, actually I believe it will be a long step on the road to rebuilding the confidence in the reputation of this House in certain quarters where it has been torn down in recent months.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. I wish to commend the gentleman for bringing this accounting aspect to the attention of the House at this time.

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, my remarks relating to H.R. 8986 will be very brief. This bill, designed to provide comparable salaries to postal and other career employees of the Federal Government has considerable merit. The section pertaining to postmasters altering their work week appropriately recognizes an employment policy consistent with private enterprise trends. I find no quarrel with these objectives.

There are many Members of Congress, myself included, who would like to support this basic adjustment in compensation as we did for the military, early this year. However, with the $10,000 salary increase included for Congressmen in title II, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for the bill. With a firm commitment to my constituency to do everything within my power to balance the budget, any vote to increase congressional salaries would have to wait until this objective is reached.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, about a year ago it became apparent to me that if we were going to have an efficient, businesslike Federal Government, we were going to have to completely restructure the Federal salary system, and to do this we would have to change the salaries of Members of Congress.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] and I stopped and hesitated a moment, and we decided this was good legislation and we put our names on it and we sponsored these bills. Eventually they were reported out. The gentleman from Louisiana sponsored a similar bill, and that is the bill which is before us.

All this talk you are hearing today is about 1 percent of this bill. The salaries of the Members of Congress, $5.4 million, are just 1 percent of the cost of this bill.

It reminds me of the two drunks who started out of the bar and staggered down the sidewalk. The only obstruction in the whole block was one lamppost. They walked up headon into it. They staggered back and started again and ran into it again. The third time they hit it and staggered back and one fellow said, "My dear friend, we are lost in an impenetrable forest."

That is the situation here. No one wants to talk about the other provisions of this bill and what a good bill it is and what it will do for efficiency and good management in the Federal Government.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Some of our colleagues say, "How can I possibly go home and tell my constituents I voted for a pay raise and I supported this bill?"

My answer is—Go home and tell them the facts. This will not be the first bill that you have to explain. On the face of it, it may have some bad features, but give them the facts and tell them this is a good bill. Tell them it is a good bill for the taxpayers. Tell them it is a good bill for the country, and tell them it is a good bill all the way around.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to have sponsored legislation of this kind. This legislation will do more to improve the Federal Government and upgrade the Federal establishment than anything we have considered in a long, long time.

I am one of those who has some faith in the good sense of the American people. I do not know of a businessman or a newspaper editor or of a constituent since I introduced this bill who has taken the time to study it who has not come out and said, "I will support it."

This legislation is needed. It is necessary legislation and it is good legislation. The American people believe that a man ought to be worthy of his hire and the American people are ready and willing to pay the Members of their House of Representatives who have such awesome responsibilities a salary that is commensurate with the heavy obligations of the position, with a 16-hour day in many, many cases, and with a half million people whose demands must be met.

Mr. Chairman, it is too bad that the Constitution makes us, the Members of Congress, the only people in the Federal Establishment who have to fix their own salaries. I am sorry it is that way. But let us face up to our responsibilties and let us not shirk them.

Of course, most of the people in my district know that I have sponsored this legislation already and before the festivities next November 3, I am sure my opponent will tell every last one of them in every last hamlet, village, and town about it. Of course, there will be the demagogs who will attack each one of you who supports the bill. Of course, there will be uninformed editors who will write editorials and there will be wisecracks such as you have heard today about this being part of the war on poverty. And you will hear all the rest of it, but this is not the first vote or the last vote that people will criticize. Maybe I can fortify some of you with a story we ran across in our hearings. The late Sam Rayburn, one of the great men of the United States in the Congress, voted to raise his pay back in the early thirties or late twenties from $7,500 to $10,000. He went home as he used to tell the story, and was out at a little smoker in the backwoods of Texas. His opponent criticized him rather bitterly for voting for his pay increase. Mr. Sam said to the assemblage, in words and in the kind of earthy language that I cannot use here—but in substance he said to them, "I came to the Congress when the pay was $7,500. I wanted the job. I would be glad to serve on the job for $5,000. I am going to be happy next year to go back and serve on the job at $10,000. But my opponent did not want the job when it paid only $7,500. He did not run for the job. But now when the pay is raised to $10,000, he is here asking for the position."

Someone might ask why this is a good bill and what are the good features of it? Many of them have been discussed. This is the first attempt in history to make sense of the Federal salary system and have a logical, orderly, and interrelated relationship of the Federal salary systems in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. It will put into the law effectively this principle of comparability which will avoid for each of you, if we can make it work, this harum-scarum election-year increase for postal workers and classified workers because we will have orderly, annual, rational adjustments every year based on the principle of comparability which is a sound principle.

This will correct an injustice to thousands of able civil servants at the top levels who devote their lives and dedicate themselves to Federal service, when they could be making far much more money in private enterprise.

I am tired of Congress downgrading itself and downgrading the Federal Establishment. We are important people. The chairmen of the great Committee on Armed Services, Committee on Ways and Means, and Committee on Appropriations, deal with the lives and safety of the people of our whole Nation. They deal with $100 billion a year. Yet we pay them, because somehow we are timid, salaries which are preposterous.

The Secretary of State of New York, who issues barbers' licenses among other duties, is paid $28,000, or $3,000 more than Secretary Dean Rusk is paid.

The police chief of Chicago is paid $30,000 a year. What do we pay Bob McNamara, who is charged with the safety of the whole country? We pay him $5,000 less. J. Edgar Hoover, who has a 14,000-man establishment for the protection of internal security, is paid $8,000 less than the police chief of Chicago is paid.

We pay the Director of the Veterans' Administration, who manages 151 hospitals, less than any self-respecting board of directors of a hospital would pay for management of one hospital. That good man is paid $21,000.

I could go on and on, but I will give one more example and then quit.

Two years ago we created the Satellite Communications Corporation, a Federal corporation with private participation. They went out to get the best brains they could. They picked a president. He is being paid $25,000 a year more than the President of the United States is paid, and yet not a word of complaint has been heard. The executive officer, who is a former Under Secretary of the Air Force and was paid $20,000, is now getting $80,000. Is his job four times more important in the Satellite Communications Corporation as his job was when he was the Under Secretary of the Air Force?

It has been said over and over again that we need good business management in the Federal Government. I agree. But let us consider this argument. The Federal Government is the largest organization of its kind in the world. Its decisions affect the lives, security, and property of 190 million Americans and people all around the world.

Federal salaries are out of line. Washington, D.C., is a happy hunting ground for the private corporations. When a man works in one of the Federal agencies and begins to show promise—to shake it up and make it efficient—he then goes out to private enterprise or to some State government, at double his previous salary.

Do you know what is paid, according to this survey, for positions of equivalent responsibility to GS–18 in private corporations? Forty-four thousand dollars is the average pay in private industry for the responsibility a person has as a GS–18.

So I ask these questions: What kind of businessman would stand by while his key executives were hired away by his competitors? What kind of businessman would refuse to increase his payroll by one-twentieth of 1 percent in order to keep his key plant manager, his sales force, and his comptroller? What kind of businessman would stand for the kind of turnover we have seen in the Civil Aeronautics Board, a very important agency regulating a multibillion-dollar business? Thirteen of the last twenty-one members have stayed an average of 3 years, though the term is 6 years. They stay only long enough to get a good job, and then they move on into private enterprise.

What kind of businessman would put the temptation and pressure of handling billions of dollars in defense contracts, down in the Defense Department, in the hands of men paid $18,000, $19,000, or $20,000 a year, when they are making decisions for 4 or 5 years ahead to affect every taxpayer in the country?

Let me carry this argument a bit further, and put the whole thing into focus. Let us suppose we are talking about a small corporation. The small corporation has $3.1 million debt, a comparison to our $310 billion debt. Let us say it plans to spend $980,000 and to take in about $940,000, so it will have to borrow $40,000. It is a $3 million corporation. Its annual payroll is $140,000, in my example, compared to the $14 billion in the Federal payroll.

For an expenditure this year of $500—that is all it amounts to compared to a $140,000 payroll—for my hypothetical corporation—this company could keep its key executives, could give them raises sufficient to keep the good men on the job; and, for an additional $5,000 in a $140,000 payroll, it could meet its competition by keeping its key workers down in the plant happy, and keep them on the job.

Let me say one thing more: There has been a lot of talk on this business of whether or not we will have a rollcall vote. I do not care whether we do or not. My position has been made very clear. I resent a little bit those who are not content to state their own position, but want to tell other Members what they must do. Any Member of this House, who wants to go on record, can march

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

down here and insert his remarks in the RECORD and let his people know where you stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] a member of the committee.

(Mr. BARRY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, before I begin my analysis of what others have thought about the pay legislation, I would like to quote from President George Washington in 1796, which quotation appears on page 368 of the hearings. He said at that time:

> The compensation of the various officers of the United States in various instances, and in none more than in respect to the most important stations, appears to call for legislative revision. * * * It would be repugnant to the vital principles of our Government virtually to exclude from public trusts talents and virtue unless accompanied by wealth.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a nonpartisan bill. This bill had its genesis in a study of Federal employee wages begun by President Eisenhower. If you will recall, a few years ago many of us in the last year of President Eisenhower's administration voted against a pay raise because we did not want to prejudice the bill with the 7-percent increase that was voted at that time over the President's veto of the bill which was passed by the Congress. Remarks have been made concerning the President having the power in this bill to change salary levels as he wills. I submit to you that the only Presidential authority in this bill to change salary levels is in levels IV to VI. In these levels the President has the power only to change from $26,500 to $29,500. So I take a very dim view of those who would oppose this bill because it gives too much Presidential authority that is felt not to be merited. Certainly, if we demand that the President of the United States confirm these people in the Senate, we would allow the Executive, whether he be Democrat or Republican, the discretion to determine between a $26,500 amount and a $29,500 amount; and that is all this bill does.

Now, just what have some former Eisenhower administration officials thought about this bill? I invite your attention to page 363 of the hearing where the President of Procter & Gamble Co., Neil McElroy, former Secretary of Defense, in a letter to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] recently. He said:

> I am sure it is generally realized that the pay reform proposals of the pending legislation not only are supported by the present administration but also conform to recommendations by President Eisenhower during his incumbency.

Then Mr. Elroy went on to say that they are long overdue and merit the support of every American interested in good government.

What did Mr. Eisenhower say about this himself? On page 367, he says, and I quote:

> If we are to retain in Government service the highly skilled and able civilian employees who contribute so much to the Nation's strength it is clear that certain revisions are needed in the statutory pay structures for these employees.

This is what this bill will accomplish. You have heard much today about comparable salaries, and I will not repeat the defense, but I would like to remind the Members of this body that Federal contractors—if you will examine your report further—are indirectly paid salaries of $23,000 to $45,000. This demonstrates that if we cannot afford to buy the kind of technical skills required or do not have the funds available to do it under the right salary structure, they are bought on the outside under a contract. So, in effect, we do hire people at higher salaries than they are currently earning in the executive department of the Government. This is a calamity and if we face up to our responsibilities we will pass legislation today that helps correct this practice.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

(Mr. DANIELS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 8986. I shall speak on a section of the bill, the comparability feature. For almost a year now we have owed the postal and Federal employees of this Nation a debt of honor. That debt is overdue. We must pay it.

As you know, in 1962 the Congress passed a pay bill which became Public Law 87-793. This was one of the most important pieces of legislation ever to affect the livelihood and welfare of postal and Federal employees. Sections 502 and 503 of that bill were designed to set up, once and for all, an orderly and dignified way of providing that these fine people in the Government service would henceforth be able to earn a living comparable to that being earned by people in similar jobs in private industry.

Mr. Chairman, Public Law 87-793 was designed to insert some order and scientific approaches to the postal and Federal pay scales. It was designed to insure our loyal and dedicated workers a comparable pay scale with those of workers in private industry. It was designed to eliminate the expensive and wasteful biennial pay campaigns that postal and Federal employee organizations have been forced to mount every year in order to keep abreast of the economic parade.

As we all know, Mr. Chairman, workers in private industry, by and large, have their pay raises written into their contracts. They get these pay raises regularly and quietly without public fanfare. The Pay Reform Act of 1962—Public Law 87-793—was an attempt to give postal and Federal employees the same kind of fair treatment that workers in private industry get as a matter of course.

In approving that legislation, the Congress contracted a sacred obligation to put postal and Federal pay on a scientific, orderly, and dignified basis.

You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that when we passed Public Law 87-793, it was the sense of the Congress that comparability pay raises for postal and Federal employees would be practically automatic whenever the President of the United States—acting on information supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics—recommended such raises.

The late President Kennedy made such a recommendation last April 29. We have been very slow—too slow—in living up to the obligations we contracted when we passed the law in 1962.

Public Law 87-793 had one flaw in it which is corrected in the present pay bill, H.R. 8986, which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] has introduced. The law, as it was enacted, provided for a built-in time lag which would give postal and Federal employees comparability, not with the wages in private industry today, but with what they were 2 to 3 years ago. The Bureau of Labor Statistics based its recommendations on data collected in late 1961 and early 1962. The President made his recommendation to the Congress in April 1963, with the proviso that the proposed pay raises would become effective on January 1, 1964.

But workers in private industry had, on an average, received two to three pay raises in the interim. So the President's proposal would leave postal and Federal employees two or three pay raises behind their civilian counterparts.

This legislation—H.R. 8986—will give these Government workers a wage scale, at long last, roughly comparable with wage scales in the private sector.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I have the privilege to be a member, has approved this pay bill. It is now the task of the House of Representatives as a whole to redeem a pledge that we have permitted to gather dust.

When the Congress approved the 1962 Pay Reform Act, only 21 Members of this House voted against it. In the other body, only six Members voted in the negative. Every person who voted affirmatively on this legislation contracted, as I have said, a debt of honor payable to the postal and Federal employees of the United States. We have been careless in recognizing this debt; we have been dilatory in paying it. Now the time has come for us to act. The integrity of the Congress is at stake, and it is our duty to preserve that integrity among those who deserve so well of us. Therefore I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, it has often been said in this game of politics that it is not the big things that count so much as the little things. Most of the heat generated by the news media on the legislation before us this afternoon has to do with that part of the bill which makes up only eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total in the bill and having to do with increases in pay for Members of the Congress.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

I had occasion over the weekend to read the bill and the report and must say that some of its provisions did cause me great concern, particularly with respect to the Congress giving to the President the power to arbitrarily set the scale of pay for those in the higher brackets of the executive branch, rather than following the traditional pattern of having the Congress set the scale. I must say that I, too, was surprised to learn of the increases that were in store for some of our officers and employees of the Congress, who have as a general rule shared in the increases granted to the postal and civil service employees over the past several years. I was concerned, too, that the total amount in the bill exceeded President Johnson's budget figure.

I am glad, however, in listening to the debate thus far to learn that the chairman, supported by his committee, will offer an amendment to cut this overall figure down to within a million dollars of President Johnson's budget figure. I certainly do not want to be in the position this afternoon of voting to increase the President's budget, for our Appropriations Committee in all of the department bills before us will be striving to keep our appropriations within the President's guidelines and, moreover, will be making substantial cuts where they can be made.

Now in addressing myself to the most controversial provision of this legislation, which I say again embodies only eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total amount in the bill, I cannot help but recall the convincing arguments for the last increase made by our Speaker, who was then majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, our minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the venerable Martin Dies, of Texas, and others. I am reminded, too, of a Member of this House who at the very outset of the debate in 1955 spoke out for increases for everybody else but himself; and while piously proclaiming that "public office is a public trust. We are servants of the people" and that Members of Congress did not need a raise, he was stashing away in 80 separate bank accounts sums of money obviously from other sources than straight salary to Members of Congress—so much so that he ultimately came under Federal indictment for income tax evasion was tried, convicted, and sentenced to prison.

Now there are those who have argued and will continue to argue that one does not have to run for Congress, that there are always those ready to take his place at the prevailing salary scale. There is no question but that voting to increase one's own salary is a very ticklish proposition, but the Founding Fathers recognized that changes would have to be made from time to time by providing in section 6, article 1 of the Constitution that "the Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law."

And I would point out further to the House, as to the constitutionality of an effective date for a salary increase, that at the time of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution the States refused to ratify a proposed amendment that no law varying the compensation of the Congress shall take effect until an election shall have intervened. The rejection of that proposed amendment reflects the recognition on the part of the people that occasion may arise requiring adjustments in compensation without procrastination; and further I believe it removes the baseless conception held by some persons that it is unconstitutional to increase compensation during the term of office.

Now I should like to address myself to the problems confronting the younger Members of this House with growing families, and who are required to maintain not only a home in our district but also one here in Washington as well. Each Member has to determine for himself what is best for his family. My wife and I prefer to have our children educated and reared in the environment of our home community of Peoria, which causes me to be more or less a commuter. In the past year I made 25 trips back and forth to my district—19 by plane at a cost of approximately $111 for each round trip, six of them by car at less cost, but with the attendant wear and tear of driving the nearly 1,700 miles round trip.

Now of this total of 25 trips back and forth to the district, I was reimbursed for only 3 and the balance came out of my salary, just as you Members must likewise do for those trips over and above the meager 3 provided for us. I do not think this fact is known generally to the public, for in talking with supposedly well-informed people, I find that some of them are under the illusion that we do not even pay income taxes on our salary and that all of our domestic travel is paid for by the Government, when such is clearly not the case.

Here in Washington I have just an efficiency apartment for which the rent last year was $2,700. With the $3,000 limitation imposed on Members of Congress for the deduction they might take on their income tax return for living expenses in Washington, there was, as you can see, only $300 left for food for the entire year, not to mention the other legitimate costs attendant with "travel away from home," as provided for in the Internal Revenue Code. We do not put the traveling businessman under this kind of limitation, and I for one cannot understand why we are so reluctant to lay the facts of life before our constituents and the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I come from the land of Lincoln, and at the time when Lincoln was a Member of this House, the pay for Members of Congress was $6 a day. There was actually a proposal to move the Capitol to Georgetown in those days because the room rent was only $8 a week in Georgetown as against a $10-a-week charge in the District of Columbia. I do not propose to remedy our problem by moving the site of the Nation's Capitol, but I do say that we ought not be afraid to face up to the facts of life and tell the people about them as far as our own personal problems are concerned.

Now over and above this, I have never yet seen a campaign in which I have been engaged in which I did not have to draw heavily upon my own financial resources. And all of us spend varying amounts for entertaining our visiting constituents. I am sure that most, if not all of us, support the religious faith and church of our choice, but one would be surprised of the number of solicitations a Member of Congress receives for church building funds going on throughout his district. The same would hold true for hospitals. Yes, and for every little volunteer fireman's ball, PTA bazaars, and what have you.

As I mentioned earlier, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] gave one of the most compelling arguments for an increase in 1955 when he recounted the days of his first coming to Washington with a growing family, and I would say that in addition to this big problem of movement back and forth from the District, these year-round sessions foreclose Members from the opportunity of participating in their own businesses, in their agricultural pursuits, or in any kind of law practice. As a matter of fact, one gets to that point where he has to make the choice as to whether he would like to continue in public service or go back to his business, industrial, agricultural, or professional pursuit, because we are no longer able to supplement our income when Congress stays in session all year long.

I have often said that this is a much more acceptable job if one has no children or is at the age where his children are through school, married and on their own. But it must be said, too, in support of a pay raise for the older more experienced Members of this House that a married Member with no children and no other income who files a joint return with his wife pays a Federal income tax on his current salary of $5,394, and that under the provisions of this bill, his Federal income tax will be $9,601, or a net income after taxes of $22,899, a net increase, then, in take-home pay of $5,793.

Earlier in the year I had occasion to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report of our findings on salaries of public officials at the Federal, State, and local level that were in excess or equal to that paid to Members of Congress. That report appeared in the RECORD on July 18, 1963, with a supplement August 19, 1963, and those figures are, of course, already outdated. But it did disclose that there were better than 2,000 public officials at the Federal, State, county, and local levels drawing salaries, exclusive of any fringe benefits, over and above that paid to Members of Congress, and those figures ranged from $22,500 to $60,000.

Mr. Chairman, one of the great rewards I have found in serving in this House is that regardless of special interest and political pressures brought to bear upon us, I have been free to speak my mind, vote my conscience, and stand for principles in which I strongly believe.

I happen to believe that our constituents would prefer that we be financially independent to call the shots here as we see them regardless of the pressures, inducements, and enticements and a salary level commensurate with our ever-in-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

creasing responsibilities will enable Members of the Congress to remain "free agents" to discharge our obligations as best we see them.

In view of the assurances given to us by the committee that amendments will be offered to bring this bill in line with the President's budget figure, I shall vote for the bill and would implore my colleagues to be strong, stiffen up, and do likewise.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, it has been years now since the Federal Government operated within its income. Year after year we have added to the national debt and just as often we have again and again advanced the national debt ceiling.

This would be regarded as a poor way to run a business. It is just as poor a way of operating a government. The time has come to put the business of this Government in order. It is up to us to reduce spending and to begin making substantial payments on the national debt. If the Congress has any idea of establishing a sensible and responsible fiscal policy, then the time to begin is now and the means of doing it is to defeat this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have for years advocated, worked for and developed a voting record in favor of a balanced budget. On numerous occasions I have voted against proposals, programs, and salary raises, all of which had merit, on the ground that the Federal Treasury was unable to bear the burdens thereof.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, will cost $600 million. To lay it aside would go a long, long way toward balancing the Federal budget. Indeed, this is what we ought to do.

Sometime ago, this administration committed itself to a program of economy. While I applaud the example, I can tell you now it is going to take more than turning off a few light to carry through on the promise. Passage of the tax cut bill was tied to a promise that Federal expenditures would be reduced. The Congress should see to it that this commitment is met. To pass this $600 million pay raise bill on the heels of that commitment would amount to a breach of faith with the American taxpayers.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill is bound to set off demands for comparable increases in wages, salaries, and profits throughout the country. This means more inflation and in the end further loss to everyone.

The salary increases provided for in this bill are neither justified nor necessary. Government pay is good. The Civil Service Commission is not encountering any trouble at all in recruiting satisfactory employees for the Federal service. I have not heard of anyone, from the highest Cabinet officer down to the lowest paid employee, quitting because of the level of salary.

We should vote this bill down and get on with the essential business of the Congress. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, there should be a rollcall vote on the bill. I, for one, will stand in favor of such.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE].

(Mr. ASHMORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending bill which would increase the salary of all Federal employees, including members of the President's Cabinet, Supreme Court Judges, all members of the Federal judiciary and Members of Congress. I oppose this bill, first, because the proposed increase for the Members of Congress and other high officials is exorbitant and unreasonably large.

In the beginning of our Government one of the leaders said:

Salaries should be fixed in the middle-ground where dignity blends with economy.

I believe this statement is practical and based on commonsense. The present salary of Congressmen and Federal judges—$22,500 per year—is a middle-ground salary under our present day economy. A Congressman can live on this salary in dignity, provided he is economical, and certainly, we should all be economy minded today with the cost of local, State, and Federal Government increasing almost every year. Our present national debt has now reached an all-time high of approximately $312 billion. In an effort to reduce this tremendous debt and also bring the Federal Budget into balance, President Johnson has announced that Federal expenditures for fiscal 1965 will be less than they were for fiscal 1964. I, and many other Members of the House, have applauded the efforts of our President to reduce Federal expenditures and thus make a Federal tax cut feasible and practical. Inasmuch as I have voted to reduce taxes and pledged myself to support the President's program of reduction in Federal expenditures, I cannot consistently and conscientiously vote for this bill, which provides for salary increase of more than one-half billion dollars annually.

The point is made by many who support this legislation that higher salaries would bring better men to Congress. If my memory serves me correctly, this same unsound argument was made in 1954 when congressional salaries were last raised. Since that raise went into effect, I have not noticed any improvement in the caliber of those of us who have the honor to serve as Members of Congress. On the contrary, there are many instances today, as well as in the past, where well qualified citizens have given up high positions to serve for less money in the President's Cabinet, the Supreme Court, Federal judiciary and the Senate and House of Representatives. Men of this capacity have freely surrendered large incomes so that they might accept positions of greater honor, trust and service in the Government of their country.

Yes, there is abundant evidence to prove that money alone does not bring the best men to Congress, or to other offices of great responsibility in our Government. It is simply love of country and the willingness to sacrifice some of the material things in life that prompts so many people of great mental ability to enter the service of our great democratic Government.

This bill provides for an increase of $10,000 per year for each Member of Congress, Federal judges, and even larger increases for members of the Supreme Court, the President's Cabinet, and others. I wish to emphasize the fact that a majority of my voting constituents do not receive as much as $10,000 in wages or salary per year. Yet, many Members will vote today to increase their own salary in the sum of $10,000 annually. I hope that this simple comparison will point out to all of my colleagues the inherent dangers involved in the passage of this bill, both from an economical and political point of view. In my opinion, if Congress expects to hold the respect and confidence of the people of this country, it should defeat this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I wish to call my colleagues attention to an editorial in the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., dated March 9, 1964. The editor of this great newspaper has clearly expressed the conservative viewpoint on this question:

ECONOMY BEGINS—SOMEWHERE ELSE

If the reader had thought that the ultimate in congressional extravagance was expressed in the $83 million-plus office building the House is constructing for one-third of its Members he is advised that this optimism is unwarranted.

The Senators and Representatives are not yet through with throwing your money away.

Next they plan to throw a little of it their way.

The House Rules Committee, that bastion of conservatism, has cleared the way for a bill to raise the salaries of most Federal employees, including Supreme Court Justices (they deserve a raise), Cabinet members, and other top Washington officials.

Also included is an increase of $10,000 per year for guess who?—why, the Congressmen, of course.

This is an increase of a whopping 44 percent for the solons since 1955 when they gave themselves another raise which almost doubled their pay.

To be jumped from $12,500 to $32,500 in less than 10 years is not bad, not bad at all. Especially considering that the cost of living has risen only some 15 percent since the last pay hike.

What the Congressmen figure they have done to deserve this munificent treatment at the hands of the taxpayers is beyond us. The last time we listened most of them were crying, not only for more economy in government but also about the sad state of things in Washington generally.

The gap between preaching and practice is rather readily apparent, however.

Of course the Congressmen have more than the necessary quota of people telling them to go ahead and raise their salary. These range from the usual sycophants who tell them how great they are, to the natural-born spenders who have a mystic attachment to squandered tax money, to the union bosses who know that few can vote against an in-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

crease in minimum wages if they have voted for an increase in congressional wages.

The net result is that the clamor for frugality is pretty well drowned out by the exhortations of self-interest.

It will take a greater noise to be heard above the din. If this kind of thing keeps on much longer, the incumbent Congressmen may hear it at the ballot boxes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I shall briefly speak on the question of increased salaries for judges. We dare not be niggardly in our compensation to our judges. The laborer is worthy of his hire. Our judges are laborers in the vineyards of the law and worthy of their hire. We should not belittle their work by underrating their value.

Economy is one thing; parismony is another. It is false economy to devalue their worth. It is parsimony to excise the bill's increase.

I am informed that somebody will offer an amendment to strike out the provision about judicial salaries. Such action would lessen their dignity, wound their pride, and affect their standing. It is vainglorious to place a cheap tag upon them.

Emerson said:

We often pay dear for a small frugality.

Unless we increase judicial salaries, lawyers of standing, attainment, and rare ability, who are much needed on the bench, will refrain from making the sacrifice in wearing the ermine of judicial office.

You cannot catch flies with vinegar. Advance in pay is the honey that will attract. Salary, of course, is not the only attraction for acceptance of judgeship. These are prestige and opportunity to render services. Justice is the bread of the Nation, because everyone hungers for it, but it cannot be had cheaply.

You cannot buy the experience needed on the bench for a song, nor the wisdom required for a will-o'-the-wisp.

Remember the safety of our people lies in our courts. The courthouse is the repository of our liberties. And it is the judge who must know how to apply the "never-changing principles of freedom to the ever-changing conditions" of this Nation. We need the best judicial talent obtainable.

Judges are no different than we are. As Shakespeare has it, "he is fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as we are."

The present era of inflation has caught up with him as with us. He too must pay the premium on his life insurance. He too must pay the interest on his mortgage. He too must pay for the education of his children. He too must pay the increases for food and raiment. He too must pay the installment due on his auto. He too must pay his income taxes. We must do unto him as we do unto ourselves. We would indeed be selfish brutes if we raised our salaries and not theirs.

I would much rather cancel out this bill in its entirety than deprive our judges of a much needed hike in salary.

I desire a satisfied, happy, contended judiciary than one disgruntled and unhappy. It is no answer to say they have life tenure.

Then we should have never raised their emolument above $7,500—that was the amount of salary accorded a U.S. district judge when I was elected to Congress 42 years ago. That was our salary also. By easy stages the salaries of district judges were raised to $10,000, 1926; to $17,500, 1946; to $22,500, 1955. Our increases paralleled theirs. With each judicial salary advance bill we heard the same argument—life tenure—each time we cast that argument into limbo. We now hear it again as a sort of echo from limbo.

It should have no weight—no more weight than a feather in a high wind.

Unlike Members of Congress, judges cannot practice law and thus supplement their salary. Their outside activities are restricted. They must pretty well stick to their judicial knitting.

Felix Frankfurter said:

A judge should be compounded of the faculties that are demanded of the historian and the philosopher and the prophet. The last demand upon him—to make some forecast of the consequences of his action—is perhaps the heaviest. To pierce the curtain of the future, to give shape and visage to mysteries still in the womb of time is the gift of imagination. These judges must have something of the creative artist in them; they must have antennas registering feeling and judgment beyond logical, let alone quantitative, proof.

Do you suppose you can procure such judges for a shilling a piece? No indeed. If a judge is to be historian, philosopher and prophet, he must be paid accordingly.

A good judge stands against unjust winds that blow, as a haven of refuge for those who might otherwise suffer, because they are helpless or weak or out numbered or because they refuse to conform to prejudice or are the victims of intolerance.

A judge rendering such invaluable service is a good judge, entitled to a good salary. Happily our courts abound in such judges.

Our judiciary in our land is second to none. Let our pride in our judiciary equal the length and content of a fair purse. The increases set for our judges are fair and equitable.

Why is a Justice of the highest Court in our land paid less than most of the successful members of the bar appearing before him earn in fees?

Furthermore, unless we make the judiciary attractive financially, then only the scions of wealth will aspire to judgeships. Then we shall set up a sort of judiciary aristocracy—a fate I would not with upon our Nation. We cannot afford to have only rich men man our judicial stations.

We must pay salaries that provide encouragement to men and women of the highest ability, dedication, legal training, judicial temperment and conviction about the American way of life.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL].

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently advocated upward adjustments in the pay of employees in the lower grades of the postal service and Classification Act schedules. Federal employees should be paid comparable salaries as those paid in private industry. However, when I voted in committee on H.R. 8986 in November of last year against the bill, I felt that only the first five grades of the Classification Act and the first four levels of the postal service should be raised. I felt that other raises should be delayed until the Federal budget was balanced. Today our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, has cut the deficit by one-half and has proposed a budget of less than $100 billion. His philosophy shows every sign of good sound fiscal governmental responsibility. In fairness and fair play, I feel now if the proposed amendments are adopted—and I feel they will be—that the bill will be reduced to come within the President's budget, and I will support the bill if it is so reduced.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, the Congress must set the example for the rest of the Government and for the people of the country. In opposing this pay raise bill, I do so because the Congress must set the example of economy, frugality, and restraint.

Inflation is still a great threat to the security of our country and welfare of our people. I fear cheap money more than I fear the Communists. The Congress must provide for the American people a sound dollar. We must have a balanced national budget. Someone must sacrifice if our economy is to be maintained and our Nation preserved.

This bill, in providing a tremendous increase in salary for members of the Supreme Court and a $10,000 annual increase in salary for each Member of Congress, is not the way to stop inflation. If we pass this bill, it will be the signal throughout the country for wage increases, and price increases; and none in the Congress could argue against it. Many organizations who are advocating the passage of this bill know that Congress, if it passes this legislation, will be in a compromising position.

The people are looking to their Representatives in this Congress to put a stop to wild Federal spending at home and abroad. We cannot do the job if we are to increase our own salary by $10,000. The people are looking to us to put the bridle on the Supreme Court—not to pat them on the back for outlawing prayer, Bible reading, and God in our schools and other sinister decisions, by increasing their salary by $10,000.

The people appreciate the fact that the Congress worked long and hard last year for economy in Government. I believe the people were proud that we

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

stayed in session right up to the Christmas holidays in order to do what we thought was right. I know the people have confidence in their duly elected Representatives. But, Mr. Chairman, we will undo all of our good work by voting to increase our own salary.

Mr. Chairman, I simply do not believe it is right to vote for our own salary increase and make it almost immediately effective.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot and will not support this bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

(Mr. GRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. GRAY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON].

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in wholehearted support of the legislation before us and also to express my support for the amendments which the chairman of the committee [Mr. MURRAY] will submit later during consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a very rewarding experience for me during this, my first term in the Congress, to have participated in the lengthy hearings and executive discussions from which has emerged the legislation now before the House.

I sincerely believe that any reasoned analysis of this legislation cannot help but lead to an equally reasoned conclusion that H.R. 8986 is extremely desirable legislation and that it should be enacted promptly.

H.R. 8986 modernizes every major Federal statutory salary system. Its primary objective is the implementation of the comparability principle which the Congress committed the Federal Government to in 1962. It also provides reasonable salary adjustments for Federal executives, judges, and Members of Congress that maintain proper and necessary pay distinctions between these officials and so-called career employees.

We have heard argument advanced here this afternoon that we cannot afford to enact pay adjustment legislation at a time when our President is engaged in promoting the strictest economy in all governmental operations. It is my considered judgment that this legislation is completely in accord with the President's economy progam and I submit that we simply cannot afford not to enact it.

The President himself has recognized, as all able administrators do, that economy achieved at the expense of low wages is illusory. A pay system that does not permit the Federal Government to recruit the best qualified personnel and encourage them to make careers of service to their Government, and which does not promote increased productivity—which destroys morale—cannot in any terms of good management be considered as contributing to economy.

Recognizing this, President Johnson in his budget message to the Congress in January in a much quoted statement, said, and I quote:

> Although this budget is deliberately restrictive, I have concluded that Government economy will be best served by an upward adjustment in salaries.

The President recommended salary adjustments on the basis of comparability for career employees, along with increased rates for Federal executives, the Congress, and the judiciary, to bring their salary levels "more nearly commensurate with their respective responsibilities." For this purpose, he allocated an amount of $545 million in the fiscal 1965 budget.

Mr. Chairman, in the private sector of our economy pay raises are always considered in the light of productivity. I think it is quite important, therefore, that we ascertain if this legislation is justified on the basis of the productivity of our Federal Government work force.

First of all, the record shows that Government employment, except for seasonal ups and downs, has remained fairly static in the past 10 years. This is true despite the fact that our total population has increased appreciably, and that the Federal Government has undertaken a complexity of new and vastly expensive missions, some of which would have been beyond comprehension 10 years ago.

In 1956, there were 19 civilian workers serving each 1,000 American citizens. The number dropped to 14 by 1956, and today it is down to 13—a 31-percent decrease. If we were to subtract all employees working in Defense, the postal service, and the Veterans' Administration, the Federal Government, for all its varied and important new activities, would be employing less people than the telephone industry.

It is certainly interesting to note that in May 1960, the Post Office Department, in consultation with management experts, made an objective projection of employment in the Post Office Department for the next 5 years. Under the projection, it was predicted that total postal employment on June 30, 1963, would be 614,000. This was the minimum number of employees it was felt would be necessary to maintain proper postal service in the face of a rapidly increasing population and a consequent increase in mail volume. The actual figures show that employment as of June 30, 1963 in the Post Office Department was 587,000—27,000 persons less than the employment estimated in May 1960. More startling, certainly, is the fact that in fiscal year 1963 the Post Office Department handled 67.9 billion pieces of mail—an increase of 1.4 billion pieces over fiscal year 1962—and that it handled this huge increase with less employees—1,316 to be exact—than were on the payroll in the preceding year.

Certainly, the record is clear that the Federal Government as an employer need make no apology for the production output of its employees.

Mr. Chairman, the weight of the economic facts of life support the enactment of this legislation. I repeat that H.R. 8986 is not only consistent with Government economy, but that it will contribute to economy and this is not a fraudulent statement. We simply cannot afford not to pass this legislation if we are to keep faith to our commitments that Federal salaries shall be comparable, where possible, to private industry salaries and if we are to promote efficiency and economy in Government.

(Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues tell me that as a Member of this House who is not seeking reelection to the Congress, I should be able to view the legislation before us today in a completely objective manner. I can only say to them it is not that easy; in fact, my departure from the wars of this body at the end of the present term makes my decision on this Federal pay bill more difficult. There are political facts of life that almost dictate the decisions of a candidate on legislative questions of this kind. As a noncandidate—and I say this with no disrespect of our political processes—the influencing considerations seem to be more numerous.

For this reason I am deeply interested in the actions that will be taken on this Federal salary bill today. There are parts of the measure which I find objectionable. I am concerned by its high cost at a time when taxes are being cut and efforts are being made elsewhere to reduce Federal spending through the curtailment and consolidation of Federal programs.

There are such obvious inequities in the bill that they lead inevitably to the question: Was the measure carefully and properly drawn? I call particular attention to the fact that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue could only be paid under this bill at what is called executive level 4. This status, in my judgment, unfairly, and improperly downgrades the office of a man who reports directly to the Secretary of the Treasury and has, among his many duties, the administration of our vast tax program through the management of an agency with more than 60,000 employees in more than 1,000 cities. Legislative history has placed the office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue at a level comparable with that of an under secretary; yet this bill we have before us today ranks the office lower than that of the Director of the Disarmament Agency, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission and many others whose management duties and personnel responsibilities do not come close to comparing with his.

I understand that an amendment will be offered today to correct this particular situation, but what of other possible inequities? Has enough consideration been given in committee to the fact that

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

this will be the third increase in salaries for Federal career employees in 15 months at a total cost of $1,650 million. The purpose of this bill, of course, is to carry out the intent of legislation enacted during the 87th Congress to bring Federal pay scales in line with those paid in private industry. I am told that this bill achieves that purpose, but I am not sure the argument will prove convincing to the $350 a month secretaries in my congressional district.

On the other hand, I can see considerable merit to many parts of the bill—particularly the increases proposed for Cabinet members and other Federal executives, Federal judges, and Members of the Congress. As one who cannot profit by the raise because of its effectiveness after my retirement, I am convinced that these high officials of our Government are deserving of greater compensation for their services. It is unfortunate that this particular part of the bill has drawn the greatest criticism.

I hold in my hand a list of executive salaries paid to their officers by many of the leading industrial corporations in the United States. This list shows that four officials of the General Motors Corp. were paid for their services in excess of $500,000 each in 1962, and three other officials of the company were paid in excess of $400,000 each. As you go down this list you find executive after executive receiving from $100,000 to $200,000 annually. Even many State governments are offering better salaries to their officials than the Federal Government. Under these circumstances, it makes it extremely difficult to ask men like Defense Secretary McNamara to give up a far more lucrative salary, come to Washington and assume the awesome responsibilities of Secretary of Defense for $25,000 annually. Not many months ago Postmaster General Day, charged with the responsibility of running the world's largest business at the same $25,000 annual salary, had to resign as Postmaster General because it was costing him more money to serve than he was making. In financial terms, he announced at the time, that he had merely "run out of gas."

Members of Congress and the Federal judiciary have not received an increase in pay since 1955. In that period there have been six salary increases for employees of the Federal classified service with a cumulative increase in pay of approximately 51 percent.

I would hasten to add that we cannot expect to pay our public servants or, as Members of the Congress, to receive compensation on a scale equal to that paid in private enterprise. We will always have to count on the dedication of a citizen to the service of his country. But it seems to me that we are going to have to do something if we are to continue to attract better men to the public service. A more reasonable salary schedule would certainly help.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending pay raise bill. It was only a few weeks ago that this House voted to reduce our income tax. This reduction meant we have decreased the Federal Government's present revenue by over $11.5 billion for the next 2 years.

Such an action will obviously add millions to the already enormous national debt. Now the pending bill proposes to needlessly spend even more unearned money. It is not only a have-your-cake-and-eat-it-too scheme, but the cake is expected to grow while it is eaten.

I am sure many Members of Congress that supported the tax reduction did so on the good faith the President actually meant if the Congress actually reduced taxes, the administration would make a concerted effort to actually reduce spending. This pay raise bill flouts its finger in the face of the Executive's promise. It is nothing but foolish to reduce your income and at the same time increase your bills.

Besides the fiscal danger of a pay raise, such a move is not needed. Many Members of Congress are making more now than they could in the outside professions.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Virginia on the points he has made with reference to the Comissioner of Internal Revenue. I am inclined to agree with him and will support an amendment to upgrade the salary level of the Commissioner. He is directly responsible to the Secretary of the Treasury and responsible for 60,000 employees in the collection of over $100 billion in taxes. He is entitled to an increase.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the many difficulties in arriving at a satisfactory agreement on any controversial bill, and certainly this bill can qualify as being controversial. Among those of us who oppose this bill in its present form, you would probably find almost as great a variety of reasons as there will be votes against the bill. I appreciate the courtesy of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] in allowing me the opportunity of making these brief observations I will make, and to point out the areas where I find myself in disagreement with the majority of the committee.

May I say at the outset that I cannot argue that there are not thousands of employees throughout this Nation who are badly in need of a pay raise, and I would think that a majority of these are employees in the Post Office Department. I know that here in the District of Columbia, and in practically all of the metropolitan centers of the Nation there are clerks and carriers who, because of their low salaries, are forced to seek employment in their off hours, and for their wives to work to supplement the family income. This problem becomes less acute as we move to the smaller towns, villages, and rural areas, where in some of the smaller post offices the clerks and rural route carriers are among the highest paid individuals in the community on a comparative basis, considering the educational and training requirements to qualify for the job. That is why I have advoctaed for years a cost-of-living formula to be included in the pay schedule of the classified and postal employees. Unions and private industry recognize this factor in establishing scales of pay.

However, I must say that I do not consider that there is the urgency for pay increases in the upper brackets of Government employees, including Members and employees of Congress. In view of the recent tax cut; the announcement of the President of his desire to curtail expenses wherever possible, and to approach a balanced budget, convinces me that under the circumstances, I cannot support a pay increase in the legislative branch of Government, just as I am opposed to increases in the other higher brackets. I do not have the fear that has been expressed by some that I would suffer political repercussions if I voted for a pay increases for Members of Congress. In fact, if the legislative pay increase were in a separate package, and could be considered on its own merits—I might say at this point that I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] made a very splendid statement in that regard—I would have no hesitancy in voting for some adjustments.

Furthermore, I feel that the legislative pay should never have been tied in with the general pay increase bill, and I am hopeful that the entire title II will be removed from this bill by an amendment. I feel certain that such an amendment will be offered. I would also hope to have the opportunity of voting for amendments which will be offered to other sections of the bill. I expect to offer some amendments to the legislative sections of the bill which would propose to place certain restrictions on any increase in congressional pay if title II remains in the bill.

I agree that the pay for a Member of Congress who devotes his full time to this job is not adequate. I have an amendment which I propose to offer which would take into account the outside income for personal services, which would imply that the Member of Congress is taking time away from this job to get other compensation. I think that should be taken into consideration and I shall offer such an amendment when the proper time comes.

In closing, may I say that I expect to be among those who will seek to secure a rollcall on the final passage of this bill.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

(Mr. FORRESTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the rule for H.R. 8986 which provides an increase in the salary of all Federal employees.

This was a very unpleasant vote to cast, but it was one vote I felt I must cast in the public interest, our country's interest, and even in the Federal employees interest.

I am reasonably certain that some Government employees need and deserve some moderate increase in salaries. This bill, however, must be voted up or down. We are not permitted to vote for increases for those that deserve increases, and, in my judgment, the bad outweighs the good so far as this legislation is concerned.

I do not believe that this one bill should cover salaries for postal workers, Government workers, Congressmen, Supreme Court Judges, and all Federal employees of every kind. It is a catch all, and, in my judgment, the various employees should be dealt with separately so far as salaries are concerned.

This bill raises the Congressmen's salaries in the sum of $10,000. The present salary is $22,500, making a raise of over 40 percent. Though our present salary is not stupendous, everything considered, we can live on it in Washington with dignity, and as well as perhaps the majority of us have been accustomed.

A few days ago this Congress voted a tax cut causing a deficit of $11½ billion, which coupled with the deficit, which the administration concedes will occur this year, will create an additional deficit of close to $20 billion. Our national debt is about $312 billion and increasing hourly. We are passing laws to prevent the flow of gold to foreign countries, and even passing laws discouraging travel in foreign countries, in order that the money spent by these travelers in foreign countries will not have to be redeemed from our short gold supply. Our President has the lights cut out in the White House at night. I think everyone will agree that if lights burn at night, they ought to burn at the White House. We are closing installations even closing weather stations costing over $10,000 annually to operate; orders are going out to military installations to cut out jobs, release civilian personnel, and use military men in jobs formerly held by civilians, because we say we must economize. Under such circumstances I cannot, and will not, support a $10,000 annual increase in Congressmen's salaries. As a matter of fact, the increases in this bill would give Congressmen, Supreme Court judges, and certain employees in Congress an increase in salary larger than the entire earnings of at least 75 percent of the people in the district I represent.

Raises in salaries do not put additional money in the employees' pockets for long. Increases produce further inflation, and in a few months the increases are completely absorbed by higher prices in the marketplace, and particularly higher increases in the necessities of life. Continued increases with inflation following these increases are destroying jobs, idling many people who are willing to work and must work, and materially reducing Government work in the various localities. People drawing social security, pensions, or annuities are having the living that they thought they had provided for themselves completely wiped out by inflation. Our money is now so cheap, that our prices on goods are so high, that we cannot sell to foreign countries. These foreign countries are unable to pay our prices, but they would if they could, and doubtless would like us better if they could buy from us instead of receiving charity from us. It embarrasses anyone to receive charity.

It is said that higher salaries would bring better men to Congress and put better judges on the bench. I have been here 14 years and I have a high regard for my colleagues, but I certainly cannot say that any improvement in the quality of the Members is due to salary increases. I do not believe that the increases in salaries have increased the quality of the judges sitting on the U.S. Supreme Court.

This bill will cost the taxpayers of America a half billion dollars annually. I have always supported adequate wages for our postal workers and our Federal Government employees, and I will support reasonable increases any time I am permitted to do so. There is a way, however, to extend proper increases to these workers without resorting to an overall bill that will materially increase salaries of Congressmen and certain other Federal employees of approximately 40 odd percent.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, as one who believes that postal and other Federal employees are entitled to a fair and reasonable rate of pay, I certainly support their cause as expressed in the bill under consideration.

With regard to the congressional pay increases, I believe that the committee should have favored an increase of 15 percent which is the rise in the cost of living since the last pay increase in 1955. This should be coupled with authority to reimburse each Member for all travel expenses for trips relating to his congressional duties to and from the district which he represents, and also to reimburse each Member in the sum of $200 each month for costs and expenses of residing in Washington.

The approach I have outlined would take the American people into our confidence, and bring them a greater awareness of the problem.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending measure. In recent weeks Congress voted the largest tax cut in the history of our Nation. To justify a tax cut of this magnitude, many who voted for it stated they expected to vote for a decrease in expenditures. Yet, the legislation under consideration today will increase—not decrease—Federal expenditures by more than $600 million.

Undoubtedly there are some increases included in the pending bill that can be justified. Others, however, are excessive and unwarranted. An increase of nearly 45 percent in the salary of Members of Congress is only one example of the latter category.

Should the Congress fail to exercise restraint in connection with its own salaries, it is unreasonable to believe that it can exert a reasonable degree of caution in connection with other Federal expenditures. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote in opposition to the pending bill, and I trust the opportunity will be given me, and other Members of like mind, to cast a record vote against this measure.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I voted "aye" on House Resolution 650 on the "rule" for H.R. 8986. Some Members may have opposed the rule because they thought it might be the only record vote during this debate. I must disagree with this thinking. Those of us who are opposed to some of the provisions of the bill believe it can be amended and realize that for it to be amended it must be debated. There is nothing evil in the rule. The fact that congressional salaries are tied up in one measure with salary adjustments of the postal workers and classified service was not the fault of the Rules Committee. That committee provided for an open rule and a reasonable amount of debate. A closed rule would have failed.

But support of the rule by a Member does not mean he is in sympathy with the provisions of the bill, but simply opens the matter for full debate and discussion with amendment at any point.

I must oppose H.R. 8986 as it is now written. I hope it may be amended tomorrow so that it will be possible to support the bill so far as postal workers and some of the other Federal career employees are concerned. I am hopeful that title II or that portion of the bill pertaining to Federal legislative salaries may be stricken out and considered separately at some future time. Certainly section 201(a), which sets the rate of compensation for Members of Congress at $32,500 per annum, should not have to be voted up or down as a part of a bill pertaining to Federal employees' salaries.

I realize a Member who talks against a congressional pay raise is not going to increase his popularity with his colleagues. The fact remains we do owe

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

$312 billion and pay about $11 billion a year in interest.

Worse yet, if we approve for ourselves a $10,000 pay raise then we become vulnerable to every group in the country, including every special group that asks for this or that whenever they come along, once we vote ourselves this raise.

It has been suggested that unless a Member asserts again and again that he wants to be on record by a rollcall vote that he is sneaking or underhanded and any other sort of vote is a secret vote. It is said he does not want to let his constituents know where he stands on this bill. I submit this reasoning is fallacious for the reason the true test of a Member's stand on this bill will depend on what he does at the time amendments are offered and whether or not he stands to ask for a teller vote and whether he walks through the teller line to seek the adoption of a perfecting amendment—where everyone in the galleries can observe this method of his voting. Furthermore, no Member can be said to be hiding from his constituents if he states his views clearly and participates in the debate.

Returning to the provisions of title II of the bill, I think some more support might have been gained for the congressional salary increase if the effective date were January 1, 1965. Then it could be said that this Congress was not voting itself an increase but was voting an increase for the 89th Congress. In most of the States, the opportunity still exists for anyone who may be so attracted to file for office in consideration of this rate of pay. Filing for office in several States does not close until June, July, August, and in a few instances in September. By making January 1, 1965, the effective date, no one could say the present Congress was voting itself a raise but simply providing for an increase in pay for the new Congress.

I submit that for the committee to provide in the bill a 44-percent increase is the wrong approach. I suspect I speak for many of the Members when I say a better approach for a compensation adjustment for Members would have been to make some allowance for expenses incurred by official trips to the district and within the congressional district with the provision that there be a strict accounting for these expenses. I think the pattern of the Canadian Parliament is a good approach in this direction. In the Pennsylvania legislature, I understand there is a similar approach to the compensation problem for members. To prove the fairness on this point of expenses the Internal Revenue Service never questions the $3,000 deduction for living expenses accorded Members here in the District of Columbia.

Congress simply cannot afford the luxury of voting a salary increase in face of several overriding circumstances. Why is this so? First, we have a national debt of $312 billion. We cannot in good conscience vote ourselves a big increase and at the same time ask everyone else to take all possible steps to decrease the national debt. This would be but an illustration of "do as we say and not do as we do." A second reason is that the Congress has just enacted the biggest tax cut in the history of this Nation. This was done in an effort to spur the economy, decrease unemployment, but when that bill was passed the Congress made the commitment to take all reasonable means to cut Government spending, and it would be a violation of this commitment for the Congress to turn around a few months later and vote itself the huge pay increase proposed in this bill. A third reason against a big increase in congressional salaries at this time is it would be inconsistent with our urging of the executive branch for restraint and reduction in Federal expenditures. President Johnson has responded and is showing determined effort to hold spending to the lowest limit consistent with good government and adequate national defense. If the Members of Congress are unwilling to exert restraint in the matter of their own salaries, then they have no right to demand economy in other Federal expenditures.

I am sure Congress looks with favor on the plight of the rank and file of Federal employees. But the postal employees in particular should be relieved of carrying all other Federal employees on their backs when it comes to salary adjustments. I hope I can support these postal and some of the classified employees in their needed salary adjustments but I cannot vote for such a small increase for postal employees and, in the same measure, vote a $10,000 increase for myself.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

(Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, while I favor a pay raise for postal and classified Government workers, I cannot vote for the bill unless salary increases for executive and congressional personnel are eliminated.

Therefore, I shall introduce an amendment to knock out pay hikes for the legislative branch, including Senators and House Members. If it fails, I will vote against the pay raise bill.

I also plan to introduce an amendment eliminating pay increases for members of the judicial branch. Supreme Court Justices are now making $35,000 per year. Based on some of their recent decisions, perhaps they should be paying the Government $35,000 per year for the privilege of being a Supreme Court Justice.

This pay bill is a mockery of sound government fiscal policy. I do not see the logic of Congress advocating economy with one hand and voting foolish salary increases with the other.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. CUNNINGHAM addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

(Mrs. DWYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, there is much in the pending bill, H.R. 8986, that I strongly support. But I feel obliged to state at the outset that I cannot accept the justification for raising the salaries of Members of Congress. I trust we shall have an opportunity to vote on this specific question, and I believe it can be done in such a way that other sections of the bill will not be jeopardized.

In most respects, it seems to me, this is a good bill, and I congratulate the members of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service for the care and diligence with which they approached the painstaking and complex job of constructing the bill. It is a major responsibility of the Congress—as representatives of the employers of civil servants—to maintain the salary structure for Federal employees so that the system itself will be internally consistent and will provide a just and equitable level of compensation in terms of the cost of living and of salaries paid for comparable work outside the Government. This objective will be achieved in large measure by approval of the appropriate provisions of the bill.

It is altogether too easy to take for granted, Mr. Chairman, the capable and often devoted public service which the people of the United States receive day after day from their fellow citizens in the postal and other Federal career services. This debate provides a valuable opportunity to recognize their continuing contributions and express our appreciation for their loyal service.

Despite my general agreement with the comparability principle, especially for employees at the lower and middle grades and levels, I am not satisfied that this principle should be slavishly followed at the upper levels of Federal executives, judges, and Members of Congress. Here the circumstances and satisfactions of Federal service are qualitatively different. I do not mean to imply that top-level civil servants and those serving under Presidential appointments should be discriminated against in regard to their salaries or that somehow they should learn to live on the sense of accomplishment they get from their work. I understand and accept the need for salary adjustments at these levels not only to do them abstract justice but also to reduce the costly attrition of highly competent officials whose personal responsibilities force them to leave the Government for substantially higher paying jobs in private industry or the professions.

I do contend, however, Mr. Chairman, that we must make some allowance for the differences between private and Government employment at these higher

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

levels. In general, I think it is fair to conclude that career Federal officials enjoy greater security than their opposite numbers in the private economy. They also have the advantage of the special incentives, prestige, and satisfaction that come from the knowledge that the general public rather than private interests are the beneficiaries of their work. It may be difficult to place a monetary value on these factors when determining salary levels, but I do think these factors justify something less than exact comparability for high level career and appointive employees.

This is true, or should be, to a much greater extent for Members of Congress. Although we all have family responsibilities, special expenses, and other financial needs, I fear we would do a disservice to traditions of public service and to the ideals of elective office if we should ever set congressional salaries at a level high enough to make the salary itself a major attraction to those who might consider seeking the office. I say this knowing full well that many of our colleagues do have a tough time meeting expenses. I say it, too, recognizing the objection to limiting membership in the Congress, in effect, to those rich enough or ruthless enough not to have to worry about their salaries. For I do not mean to suggest that congressional salaries should never be raised or that nothing valid can be said in favor of maintaining them at a respectable level within the context of Government salaries generally.

What I do suggest is that there is more to this job than money—more, in fact, than there is in any other job in the world with the sole exception of the Presidency. We do not pay the President the more than $1 million a year many tycoons of private enterprise are paid, nor anywhere near it. But I doubt seriously if anyone here would contend that this reflects adversely on the office or the person of the President or somehow diminishes public respect for his awesome power and responsibilities, or even reduces the field of prospective candidates for President. On a slightly lower scale, the same point can be made about Congress. Some financial sacrifice is part and parcel of election to this high office. I do not believe we can rightly eliminate it. For, when we seek this office, we are not reaching for a plum; we are offering to serve.

I would also object to the congressional pay raise provisions of the bill on grounds of bad timing. We have not yet convinced the people we represent, in my judgment, that Congress as a whole deserves a 40 percent or higher increase in salary. Unfortunately, the reputation of Congress among the people generally is not at its highest. To a certain extent, at least, we share the responsibility for this situation, since we have not taken affirmative and effective steps to reshape and improve the procedures which govern our activities or to impose upon ourselves the higher standards of conduct and performance which people have a right to expect.

At this time, then, Mr. Chairman, respect for the opinions and values of our people would seem to me to counsel against this sizable increase of our own salaries.

Finally, I am led to protest against the self-imposed necessity for Members of Congress to determine their own and their colleagues' salaries. There is something slightly distasteful about it, something approaching a conflict of interest situation, which Congress should seek means of avoiding—if honorable and responsible means of avoiding it can be found.

I wonder if, in past efforts to avoid this dilemma, sufficient attention has been given to the possibility of devising a permanent and self-perpetuating formula under which a disinterested and wholly objective committee outside the Congress could be assigned the responsibility, under generally accepted standards and criteria related to the office, of establishing and revising from time to time the level of compensation for Members.

The benefits of such a formula are obvious. Among others, we would be freeing ourselves to do a more dispassionate job of determining salary levels throughout the rest of the Government. And we would be removing any trace of suspicion that what we do about Federal salaries may at the same time benefit ourselves.

Lacking such a formula, Mr. Chairman, and considering all the relevant circumstances, I do not believe we should raise our own salaries in this bill. I expect an amendment will be offered removing congressional salaries from the bill and I shall vote for this amendment.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as remains on this side.

Mr. Chairman, we all who are Members of this body, recognize that it is a hard and a disagreeable task to deal with the salaries of all of the people in the Federal Government from the Vice President down to the page boy, including ourselves.

However, Mr. Chairman, the duty for so doing falls squarely upon our shoulders. We must necessarily face up to that responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, in reviewing, and for reemphasis, some of the arguments that have been advanced I believe these things are vital. In the Salary Act of 1962 we wrote into that act this feature of comparability. I said on the floor of the House at that time and before our committee that we were definitely setting up a system whereby there would be an annual pay bill dealing with Federal employees' salaries, because we included in that bill the positive directive to the President of the United States that he should annually, based on a consideration of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, make a recommendation to the Congress on the matter of salary adjustments.

We wrote that law, we established the principle, and as a result thereof this measure is before us today.

Then we have something else that was equally foreseeable and that is we set up a situation in which we were pressing the classified salaries, particularly in the supergrades, up against the $20,000 limitation, and up against the congressional salary. Right now, if this bill were to pass with title II, or the congressional salary stricken from it, what we would have would be a situation in which people in the four highest grades of the classified service would be making more money than a Member of the House or Senate. Salaries in grade 18 would go to $24,500 which would, of course, be $2,000 higher than the congressional salary. That situation simply could not exist. I know there are many of us, and I might be included among them, who would prefer that congressional salaries were not in this bill. But how are you going to escape the responsibility? How are you going to go on allowing increases in the executive branch, allow increases in the classified service, allow increases in the judiciary, and then say to the Members of Congress that you are not worth as much money as the people employed under your legislation? We can make ourselves awfully absurd.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Would it not be practical to go on and make these other adjustments so that we may have them smoothed out, then consider the legislative branch separately, and we would know where we are?

Mr. CORBETT. I agree with the gentleman about the timing on this particular bill and the consideration of it, but I would do it the other way around. I think consideration of congressional raises should take place, then have the adjustments made afterward. They should not be in the same bill. You should have this legislative action happening simultaneously or prior thereto, or you are not going to know where you are going.

I may say to the gentleman on the timing and the introduction of this legislation, that was a matter of choice of the leadership on his side. We had nothing to do with it.

In this connection somewhere along the line I propose to offer a motion to recommit with instructions. That motion, whatever it eventually will be, depends in part on what is done in Committee of the Whole. But it will keep everything within scale in titles II, III, and IV, which is the legislative, executive, and judiciary. If you pick out one specific point in this bill, with the rarest exception and amend it up or down, you are going to have inequities, disproportionment, and so forth. So any motion to adjust the salary schedules in titles II, III, and IV has to be done in a lump approach.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You would make one exception, and that is in the terms of some of the employees of the House who were specifically stated. I think you would want to change that.

Mr. CORBETT. I might say to the gentleman the only reason I am not going to introduce an amendment to place them in the same category as classified service is because my colleague from Arizona is going to do it, and I shall

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

support that. So we are going to treat them exactly as we treat people in the classified service.

Having gone over the matter of the comparability feature, I think something else ought to be pointed out. In the past 15 years we have had salary bills before us for the Federal employees. Those bills have increased the salaries of Federal employees on an average of about 5 percent a year. They have resulted from tugs of war, from shotgun situations, they have resulted from discharge petitions, everything of the like. And that 5 percent a year, I might say, is really compounded. It is 5 percent on top of 5 percent on top of 5 percent. With that, they went up quite a ways. If it should happen that the Bureau of Labor Statistics is accurate in saying as far as it can be predicted that the cost of living will go up in the neighborhood of 3 percent a year, or the comparability will go up 3 percent a year, then the pay raises that are going to happen from the establishment of this principle will be less than the pay raises that have resulted from the necessary test-of-strength pay raises. So we are not doing something here that is outlandish, that is fiscally irresponsible. We are doing the exact opposite.

I want to say about the matter of fiscal responsibility that two of the persons who spoke against the rule on this bill got up here and fought and bled and died, and some others as well, on the matter of balancing the budget, fiscal responsibility and whatnot. I looked up the record. Here is a bill that ultimately could cost in the neighborhood of $540 million for persons. They voted among other things for the feed-grain program, and what did the feed-grain program cost in the last fiscal year? It cost $936 million. I assume that they probably voted for the cotton bill and the peanut bill and some other things, too. I do not know for sure, but in fiscal 1961 the feed grain bill, which was gaining full momentum, cost $800 million even then. This means that in the last 2 fiscal years for which there are records the feed grain bill has cost $1,745 million. I did not vote for it. The fact of the matter is the bill passed by a vote of only 208 to 196.

But when we are talking about the feed grain responsibilities, I think I would rather in a great country, a wealthy country, realize that one of its first responsibilities after interest and pensions is proper compensation of its employees. If we are going to be fiscally responsible, and I hope we are, we certainly would do better to take it out on grain than on persons.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When the gentleman voted to bring this bill out of committee, am I correct in assuming that this comparability feature had been satisfied, in his opinion? Was the comparability satisfied?

Mr. CORBETT. I was checking something else here for a moment. Did not the gentleman vote for that feed grain bill, too?

Mr. GROSS. I do not think I did. No, I do not think I did, I will say to the gentleman. I do not think I did. I will check it up tomorrow and let the gentleman know.

Mr. CORBETT. What was the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. On the subject of the subsidy, I would hate to have the total of the subsidies that have gone into Pennsylvania and its industries on the part of the Federal Government. I think we would get a pretty good figure.

Mr. CORBETT. I might say to the gentleman, Pennsylvania has done pretty well—we have gotten back about 80 cents for every dollar that we turn into the Federal Government. That is a pretty good record.

Mr. GROSS. That is a better record than the State of Iowa has.

Mr. CORBETT. Maybe we may have more talented people—I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. What about this comparability feature? The gentleman supported that in the committee. As I understand it, tomorrow there will be an amendment offered to reduce the total amount of this bill by what—$170 million or something like that? There was this comparability feature when it came out of the committee. The gentleman supported it. Will it be comparable and will it be on the basis of comparability tomorrow if the amendment is adopted?

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman well knows and his question is more a matter of irritation than information and we recognize that comparability cannot be achieved in a single day, particularly when we have influential Members of this House who are against it. Second, we have to make these steps step by step. I think this will go a long way in the right direction. One of the reasons certainly for the chairman putting in this amendment, and the gentleman knows it, is because he wants to be financially responsible. There are $545 million budgeted for a pay raise and we are trying to hold the figure right on that line because of the sound advice of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for the compliment.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to compliment the gentleman for the statement he has made here. It is very obvious the gentleman has made a thorough and objective study of the issues involved. He has made an objective presentation of the issues to the House and I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. I thank the gentleman very sincerely.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in closing, I do believe that we can very well adopt the amendment to be offered by the chairman of the committee to title I. I believe we can scale back titles II, III, and IV and still allow plenty of room to prevent compression in the near future. I hope after these things have happened that we do pass this bill. The chief reason I am in favor of the bill, if it is amended as indicated, is because of the very criticism that has been directed against this body by people who have not liked the way we conduct ourselves. To my mind, if we are going to be a body deserving of respect and if we are to set an example of good, efficient activity in the Government of these United States, we ought to be equipped with the independence that the gentleman from Illinois spoke of; we should be properly staffed and we ought to be properly dedicated and we ought to do what we can not only to elect good men to this House, but to keep them here when we get them. So I hope, after we have properly considered the amendments, that we do our duty and pass this bill and raise the salaries of the Federal employees to a more comparable position, and I think we may feel proud of our efforts.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I would like to join the gentleman from Louisiana, the majority whip, in congratulating the gentleman for his very courageous and very enlightening speech. I think the gentleman has taken a sound position. It is not an easy position to take. I would point out to the gentleman, and to the House, that none of the criticisms that I have seen in the press about this salary raise has been directed toward the judiciary or any of the other executive branch or departments at all, which branches of the Government are, of course, included in the bill. The only attack that has been made has been made on the Congress. This is nothing unusual. The Congress always is the whipping boy and, I suppose perhaps, in a democracy that is the way it has to be. But I am always reminded of what former President Truman said, and I like to apply this rule in my own case—if you cannot take the heat, you ought to get out of the kitchen.

But for the benefit of some of these people whose consciences seem to be bothering them, I would inform the gentleman, and I have informed the managers of the bill on this side, that I have an amendment that I will offer tomorrow at the proper time which will permit any gentleman who feels that his conscience bothers him, to waive any part or all of the increase; or for that matter if he thinks he is not worth it, he can waive the entire salary.

I have it on good authority, from no less than the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who has told me he will so state on the floor, that this also will exempt any such Member or Members from any tax liability for that portion of the salary which is waived.

I shall offer this amendment not facetiously—it merely will provide that any portion may be waived—but in the sincere hope that it will be agreed to. If it is agreed to, some of those who have lobbied me on the last pay increase to vote for the bill, when they could not

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

vote for it but wanted to be first in line to get the money—and I have a list of them—may wish to waive a portion. If they do not waive a portion, I shall undertake to let their constituents know the depth of the hypocrisy they have reached in this matter.

Mr. CORBETT. I would remind the gentleman of a closing session when we were to vote on adjournment. A number of Members brought their suitcases to the floor. They wanted to leave town at once. They hoped that we would vote to adjourn, but they would not.

Mr. HAYS. The same situation existed. I recall at least two Members who said:

Well, I hope you will vote for it. My name is high on the alphabet and I will be later on the roll, but I will be there to get the check even though I cannot vote for the increase.

Mr. CORBETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Though I do not wish to be in opposition to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, I might say that the Comptroller General of the United States on April 15, 1955, when a similar question arose on the other pay bill, addressed a letter to the Sergeant at Arms about it. I will read exactly what he said:

In our decision of March 19, 1925, A-8427, to the then Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives, involving a similar situation, we held that the payment of salary of Members of the Congress could be made only at the rate fixed by law. Accordingly, you are informed that Members of the Congress may not, in the absence of statutory authority, waive any portion of their statutory salaries.

Mr. HAYS. That is the point, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. CORBETT. Just a moment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield for 30 seconds.

Mr. HAYS. The crux of it is, "in the absence of statutory authority." They did not have it. My amendment would give it to them. That would change the whole situation. If the amendment is agreed to, they will have statutory authority.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I wish to interrupt for just a moment. If the bill does not pass, this argument is quite academic.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would agree. I do not wish to be in an argument with the distinguished gentleman, but the original opinion, which was in 1925, went on to say that even if it were possible for a Member to waive the salary it could always be claimed and would be required to be paid to his heirs.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. Not at this time. The gentleman can offer his amendment and tomorrow it can be discussed.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8986, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964. I do so because this pay increase bill is unwarranted and unwise at this time, and represents a clear breach of faith with the American people.

Just 2 weeks ago this House and the Senate approved the conference report on the tax reduction bill. We did so with ringing pledges of economy in Government. These pledges were necessary, many of us felt, if the tax cuts were to be justified, and it was on the basis of these pledges that the tax bill was passed. In fact, we were told by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, that upon passage of the tax bill we must:

Be careful as we proceed after the enactment of this legislation—keep in mind the pledge that we made to exercise all the possible restraint that we can on the spending side of Government.

Yet, today we are being asked to make a mockery of these pledges of economy. We are being asked to approve a pay hike for Federal employees and Members of Congress that would total anywhere from $544 million to well over $600 million. Surely, if we are to approve spending this much money we shall have to find justification for it. Yet there is little or no justification for most of the pay raises contained in this bill.

It is at the higher echelon levels of the executive department, and the legislative and judicial pay raises authorized by this bill that all justification is thrown to the winds. Surely at a time when we are running in the red, with deficits of over $10 billion for the current fiscal year and $5 billion projected for next year, we cannot justify these pay increases. Further, we have just had a substantial increase in take-home pay through the tax reduction bill. Yet we are being asked to ignore fiscal responsibility and approve pay increases which in the case of Members of Congress amount to $10,000 per year—a 44-percent increase. I submit to you that we have not earned this pay increase. Also, our judiciary is not exactly starving. We seem to forget that life tenure and more than generous pensions toward which the judges make no contribution represent "fringe benefits" of considerable magnitude. And the higher echelon executive branch employees, like Members of Congress, should be willing to forego pay increases until Congress and the administration get our Federal fiscal house in order and balance the budget. Even if these pay raises are approved, they should not go into effect until budget receipts exceed expenditures by an amount sufficient to cover the cost of this bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I intend to stand up and be counted on this measure. As sure as I am standing here an attempt will be made to have this bill passed by a voice vote or teller vote: in other words, to avoid at all costs getting each Member on record as to how he stands. I for one intend to demand a rollcall vote on this measure, and I hope enough of my colleagues will join me so that our constituents can see for themselves which of us has the audacity to vote himself a $10,000 pay increase at a time when we are already running far in the red. Mr. Chairman, I obviously feel very strongly about this measure. I only hope that in light of the economy pledges we made just 2 weeks ago, that those who feel as strongly in favor of this measure as I do against it will stand and be counted with me. If this is done, if we get a rollcall vote on this bill, I am confident that H.R. 8986 will suffer the resounding defeat it deserves.

(Mr. KNOX asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], is recognized for 8 minutes, to close the debate.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

(Mr CORBETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

(Mr. BROTZMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it was proper to grant a rule so this pay raise bill could be brought to the floor, amendments presented, and then to permit each Member to vote for or against the bill according to his conscience by rollcall vote.

I regret that the measure includes raises for Members of Congress along with increases for Federal employees. Certain adjustments for Federal employees including postal workers are indicated but I do not believe that Members of Congress are entitled to a 44-percent increase in order to do this. Certainly not, in face of the largest tax cut in history coupled with the Nation's astronomical debt in excess of $300 billion, this is an invitation to the most dreaded tax of all—inflation.

Unless the proposal to increase congressional salaries is removed, I intend to vote against the measure.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8986, the Federal pay raise bill is in reality a pay readjustment measure. The $545 million measure is supported by the administration and executive and business leaders throughout the Nation. It provides for an increase in pay for 1.7 million Government employees and an increase of $10,000 in the salaries of Members of Congress.

The pay raises for Federal executives and employees are in conformity with those wages paid by private industry for

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

comparable positions. The last pay raise voted—1962—initiated this principle as a basic consideration for future legislation at this level.

Since 1945 the Government employees have received through congressional enactment 10 raises. The 590,000 postal employees received a 6.2-percent increase and other employees numbering 1.1 million—classified and other white-collared help—received 4.86-percent increases. All throughout the history of these raises by the Congress the greater pressures were activated by the better organized Federal groups of employees, thus the emotional or political advantages of pressures resulted in a superficial and loose consideration of the problem as a study—no comparative figures developed between industrial compensatory tables of wages and those of Government workers, thus establishing a basic relationship between the Federal salary system and those of industry, as reflected in comparative employment statistics prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in their statistical tables, which estimate the average annual adjustments of between 2½ and 3 percent will establish the comparability law in Government.

It is contemplated that the comparability principle in fixing of Federal salaries will effect a 50-percent decrease in the expense incurred in increased salary expenses.

The BLS survey of 1961–62 is used as the basis of the rates in the bill. A 1962–63 study advocated a 3-percent increase above those of the administration in Federal pay, but also recommended a cut in the salaries of the middle and higher bracketed employees—below the 1961–62 figures.

The administration approves the bill with the reservation that in the future a bill to correct the inequities in the middle and top grades be enacted to fullfil the principle of complete comparability with similar positions in industry and business.

As far as the judges of the courts no one can deny that their judicial abilities and talents would in private fields of their profession earn far more than their Federal salaries.

An equally important provision of the bill provides for an increase of $10,000 for the Members of the Congress—the uninformed citizen would be critical of the Congress voting a pay raise for its Members at what critics say is an ill opportune time period when the financial stability of the Nation is continuing in the deep red side of the ledger; and all sorts of suggestions in public, business, and political circles are advanced on theories to secure a total economic conservatism in Government spending.

Just what is the financial situation confronting the Members of the Congress relative to questions involving the inadequacy of the present level of salary. Although the present salary—$22,500—appears to the same as substantial sum as compensation for the Federal services at this level—yet few ctitzens realize the terrific expenses incurred by the Members of the Congress in meeting the financial responsibilities of this office.

To begin with the income tax retention as the part of the Government amounts the average case of one married with one dependent at 17½ percent of salary equal to about $3,800 per year.

The contributions at all levels of charities and programs for medical research aid foundations, school groups visiting Washington, travel fares—incidental to required return to attend district functions and congressional business; further the maintenance of two homes and offices far beyond the Government allowances. No small item is the wide range of gifts, donations, and emoluments given to constituents, and services—tips and cab fares. Further the obligations of a political nature including the contributions to churches, medical programs and above all the dinners to visitors in Washington. Substantial sums are also a needed outlay of 7½ percent of salary for the pension fund and policies insuring life at $10 to $12 per month and health at $10 to $12 per month for family protection. Many of the Members who are elected from districts sans political organizations must wholly finance their own political units in order to perfect a working and functioning campaign for their election. Many are in a serious financial condition due to the heavy costs between yearly interval campaigns each 2 years. The Members with growing families are beset with problems of school and college tuition, also subsistence costs of education.

Unless the salary increase as proposed in this legislation in a few years only persons of affluence can be expected to place their names upon the lists as candidates for congressional office.

There are less than 1,600 offices and positions covered in the congressional, executive, and judicial salary provisions at an aggregate cost of $15.7 million and represents but 2.6 percent of the total cost of the bill. These changes have been recommended strongly by recognized authorities on the subject both in Government and private life. The bill establishes basically a sound salary system for all levels of Government. Also, the continued application of the comparability principle to salaries of postal and other career Federal employees depends in the final analysis on the salary levels of Federal executives, judges, and Members of Congress.

Fair and substantial salaries will retain in the Government employ executives in key posts—judges of high repute and talented abilities, authorities in their profession—and attract and continue at the legislative level of Government capable and skilled legislators and individuals who are fit to accept the heavy responsibilities of the office and in dedication to this service are not beset by financial deficits in their public and family obligations.

The committee in its proposal has presented a realistic bill in H.R. 8986 as a result of long study and thorough research of the problem. My compliments and appreciation are extended to its illustrious Chairman TOM MURRAY and the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for their inestimable valued contribution to the perfection of good sound Government operation insuring, through efficient and intelligent personnel, a strong functioning Government.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, it has barely been 2 weeks since final passage of a tax bill which will reduce Federal revenues by some $11.5 billion. We have been told that the Federal deficit will approximate $10 billion in the present fiscal year, and the projected deficit for the 1965 fiscal year is $5 billion. The President has predicted that the national debt will go from the current figure of $310 billion to a total of $317 billion on June 30, 1965.

With such a fiscal picture there is an urgent need for economy and fiscal responsibility. We have an obligation to the American taxpayers to hold the line on additional spending until we put our fiscal house in order. We at least should know the economic consequences of the recently enacted tax reduction program.

This is a most inappropriate time to consider increases in the salaries of top officials of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, along with other Federal employees.

In any consideration of Federal payroll adjustments it must be remembered that in January of this year a pay increase ranging from 2 to 8 percent became effective automatically under present law. This added $380 million annually to payroll costs. There was another Federal employee pay increase in October 1962, which added costs of about $670 million annually. The total civilian payroll for the year ending January 31, 1964, came to nearly $16 billion.

In the past, I have favored pay legislation designed to improve the living standard of classified and postal employees and to keep Federal employees on a sound comparability basis with business and industry. I recognize that there are civil servants at the lower and medium scale of the pay ladder who are deserving of further consideration and whose pay should be increased.

However, the overall fiscal position of the Federal Government cannot be ignored in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, when I supported final passage of the tax bill a little more than 2 weeks ago, I told my constituents:

> The enactment of this tax legislation must be recognized as a commitment by both Congress and the President to reduce Federal spending where possible, and apply rigid discipline in appropriations and expenditures. I will support such an effort.

I intend to uphold my pledge to the taxpayers of my district. With the condition of the Federal Treasury in mind, I cannot in good conscience support H.R. 8986.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, even if all of the increases called for in this legislation were needed and could be justified by statistics, comparable salary comparisons, cost of living needs and the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

like, I would still be against this measure because of one aspect alone. That is the audacity we are displaying by even considering an increase in salary for Members of Congress.

This Government continues to run in the red at the rate of $10 billion a year. We certainly don't know how the new tax cut will affect the economy, some high-level optimism notwithstanding. And there is still no concrete indication that this Congress is really ready to hold a firm line on spending. But we do have the nerve to bring up a pay bill that contains a $10,000 a year salary increase for every Member of this Congress.

I am bitterly opposed to congressional salary increases at this time. This Congress should go on record against such pay boosts until the Federal budget has been in balance for at least 6 months and shows every indication of remaining that way. To enact such pay legislation now is to charge the cost to future generations.

It should not be necessary to remind ourselves that there are plenty of unsolved problems floating around these halls that need more attention than this legislation today. Let us take a close look at spending policies, or at the problems facing American agriculture, for instance. It is time we demonstrate to the American public that we are worth that much money before reaching for this pot of Government gold. Borrowed gold at that.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, Government pay increases during periods of Government deficit financing are imprudent, at the least. This is fiscal irresponsibility. Deficit financing by Government inflates the currency, that is, cuts the buying power of the dollar. This is too dear a price to pay for pay boosts, worthy though they may be.

As to the merits of this bill, otherwise, I find much good sense in the several minority views in the report accompanying the bill. Yet, I see no reason to analyze the pay bill as to merit or demerit when deficit financing rules out any pay boost.

Yet, lest I be subject to criticism for not further outlining my views, particularly since Members of Congress are involved I must add this. Comparability is a difficult principle in equating private and Government jobs. Yes, it should be kept in mind as one factor. Yet, I recognize also that the service of an elected official is different from private enterprise, and the appointed official is in yet another category.

I want to make this plain, that I believe that Members of Congress should be paid more, in order that men may serve without outside income, or without being independently wealthy, or without being in the position of conflict of interest. The pay should be enough to attract men of top ability who then can live on their salary. To me this is most important.

If the budget were in balance, I would approve the salary increase for Members of Congress. Also, I would outline further my beliefs as to the other pay increases of classified Federal employees, postal employees, judges, and the other Federal employees covered by the bill.

As Members of Congress we should earn the pay boosts for all Government employees, including Congressmen, by expenditure control resulting in the surplus beyond the balanced budget which then could go into this pay bill.

Even as we should have earned the tax cut we should earn the pay boost. Any other conduct on our part, I hold, is wrong and fiscally unsound.

[Mr. QUIE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill H.R. 8986, now under consideration and known as the modernization of Federal salary system. The title of this bill is a misnomer and is nothing more than the wholesale increase of Federal salaries to the tune of nearly $600 million annually. If this bill is enacted into law, it will complicate an already serious situation and further contribute to inflationary conditions, disturbing the economy of the Nation at a time when all thoughtful citizens should be concerned about such matters.

The passage of this bill means the spending of money that we do not have. It means an increase in expenditures when the present Congress has already voted to cut taxes. It is not sound in principle to increase appropriations and reduce taxes at the same time. Such a procedure is contrary to my philosophy of government and to the legislative record which I have established throughout my entire public service extending over a period of 40 years.

The most objectionable feature of the proposed legislation is that it boosts the salaries of officials and others who are already in high salary brackets, certainly in brackets sufficient to support them and their families in a manner fitting to their respective positions.

I am opposed to increasing the pay of Members of Congress until such time as Congress balances the budget. The services of patriotic men and women cannot be bought over the counter like common merchandise. Public service is an honor and a trust, and we should have men in public office who are willing to sacrifice whatever is necessary to save our country from fiscal imbalance and ruin. Our country was not made great by men who were holding out their hands and crying for more pay. Our country was established by workingmen who were lifters and not leaners.

I am likewise opposed to increasing the salaries of Cabinet members and Supreme Court Justices and others. Irrespective of whether or not these public servants are worthy of higher pay, I cannot give my approval to such an increase at a time when our national budget is so far out of balance.

It would be pleasing to me to be able to approve a further raise for the governmental and post office workers in the lower brackets to offset the inflation of recent years which has, in effect, reduced their pay. But we have in the past 8 or 9 years increased the pay of many of these workers by approximately 50 percent and the result each time has meant more inflation and has brought little, if any, relief, certainly not to those who are harassed with financial problems.

My position on this legislation is a matter of principle from which I cannot deviate. I would be willing to vote for legislation to relieve those who are feeling the results of intensive inflation, but I am not convinced that this Nation is in such a financial condition that it can appropriate more than half a billion dollars a year for such a purpose.

In my opinion, such a proposal is unconscionable and smacks of a salary grab at possibly the worst time in our history when the Government is already in financial straits.

[Mr. UDALL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] is recognized for 4 minutes to close debate.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I think the gentleman who immediately preceded me has made, probably much more adequately than I could, the point that I wanted to make; namely, that we do live in a country which requires the very best brains that we can bring to the Government to operate the vast and complex installations, the scientific operations, the nuclear projects, the defense projects, the research laboratories, which maintain the vitality and the very security of the United States of America.

We have a great country and we have a strong country. The main motivation which brings people to the service of our country is patriotism and love of country.

This has been true in every administration that I have had any connection with. I know that men who have come here to serve in the Cabinet, to serve in under-Cabinet positions, to serve as research specialists in the National Institutes of Health, to work in the atomic energy program, to work in the fantastically complicated programs of the Defense Department involving the use of these missiles and this weaponry which none of us dreamed about just a generation ago. I know that most of these men—and I say most of them, but really all of them—come because of a sense of duty and a sense of patriotism, and not because of the material reward connected therewith. If the only motivation was the pay that they receive, most of them would not come.

But because of love of country they come here. I think it terribly unfair that we penalize people for that. I realize that it is impossible to have the same compensation, moneywise, in Government that you have in private industry, but I think that every study that has been made by every impartial, objective board indicates that adjustments are badly needed in the Federal salary system.

I know that it is easy for us to talk about the pay of the Members of this body. When I think back to the responsibility of Members of Congress in the days even when I first came here as compared with responsibilities today, there is a remarkable difference.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

A few years ago, prior to World War II, we had a budget of something like $14 or $15 billion, if that much. Today we have a management responsibility of about $100 billion a year.

Somebody mentioned some of the committee chairmen. We have some subcommittee chairmen who have to handle $50 billion a year. The notion that any man can serve here and do his job adequately and well without giving his full time to it—and I mean full time, morning, noon, and night, and in between—as all of you know, is one that any conscientious Member of this body rejects and repudiates.

So I say that, as I see it, this bill is a bipartisan bill. It is the result of many years of study. It seeks to make adjustments which are needed desperately, particularly in the executive branch of the Government.

I hope that on tomorrow, when we come back, all the Members on both sides, those who are for this bill as well as those who are against it, will be here on the floor. I hope they will listen to the debate objectively and with an open mind. And I think if they do that, we will legislate intelligently tomorrow and pass this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the bill by titles, instead of by sections, for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY SYSTEMS

Short title

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1963".

Classification Act employees

SEC. 102. (a) Section 602(a) of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 843) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (76 Stat. 843; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"'Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,385	$3,500	$3,615	$3,730	$3,845	$3,960	$4,075	$4,190	$4,305	$4,420
GS-2	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430	4,555	4,680	4,805
GS-3	4,005	4,140	4,275	4,410	4,545	4,680	4,815	4,950	5,085	5,220
GS-4	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830
GS-5	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,155	6,320	6,485
GS-6	5,505	5,690	5,875	6,060	6,245	6,430	6,615	6,800	6,985	7,170
GS-7	6,050	6,250	6,450	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250	7,450	7,650	7,850
GS-8	6,630	6,850	7,070	7,290	7,510	7,730	7,950	8,170	8,390	8,610
GS-9	7,210	7,455	7,700	7,945	8,190	8,435	8,680	8,925	9,170	9,415
GS-10	7,840	8,110	8,380	8,650	8,920	9,190	9,460	9,730	10,000	10,270
GS-11	8,550	8,845	9,140	9,435	9,730	10,025	10,320	10,615	10,910	11,205
GS-12	10,200	10,555	10,910	11,265	11,620	11,975	12,330	12,685	13,040	13,395
GS-13	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
GS-14	14,170	14,660	15,150	15,640	16,130	16,620	17,110	17,600	18,090	18,580
GS-15	16,460	17,030	17,600	18,170	18,740	19,310	19,880	20,450	21,020	21,590
GS-16	18,935	19,590	20,245	20,900	21,555	22,210	22,865	23,520	24,175	-------
GS-17	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
GS-18	24,500	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

,,,.

(b) The first sentence of subsection (c) of such section 602 is amended by striking out "The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom Compensation Schedule II of the General Schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted," and by inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 504 of this Act, the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted,".

SEC. 103. (a) Section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1131), relating to new appointments, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 801. All new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade, except that in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission which provide for such considerations as the candidate's existing salary, unusually high or unique qualifications, or a special need of the Government for his services, the head of any department may appoint individuals to positions in grade 13 and above of the General Schedule at such rate or rates above the minimum rate of the appropriate grade as the Commission may authorize for this purpose.".

(b) Section 1105 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1071, note), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1105. The provisions of section 507, title VII, and title VIII of this Act shall not apply to professional engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and professional positions in the physical and natural sciences and medicine placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule in accordance with subsection (b) or subsection (j) of section 505. The President or an agency or agencies that he designates shall issue regulations governing the rate of basic compensation within the grade to be received by any officer or employee occupying, appointed to, or promoted to, such a position, and, in the case of reduction in grade, may issue regulations governing retention of the rate to which the officer or employee was entitled immediately before reduction."

(c) Section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(b)), relating to the limitation on numbers of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of such Act, is amended by striking out "which may be placed in such grades" and by inserting in lieu thereof ", examiner positions under section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 244; 5 U.S.C. 1010), and positions placed under this Act pursuant to section 309 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1963, which may be placed in such grades".

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 104. Section 1 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

"'revenue unit' means that amount of revenue of a post office from mail and special service transactions which is equal to the average sum of postal rates and fees received by the Department during the fiscal year for 1,000 pieces of originating mail and special service transactions determined in accordance with section 2331 of this title.".

SEC. 105. Section 702 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 702. Classes of post offices

"(a) Effective at the beginning of each fiscal year the Postmaster General shall divide post offices into four classes on the basis of the revenue units of each office for the second preceding fiscal year. He shall place in the first class those post offices having 950 or more revenue units. He shall place in the second class those post offices having 190 or more revenue units, but less than 950 revenue units. He shall place in the third class those post offices having 36 or more revenue units, but less than 190 revenue units. He shall place in the fourth class those post offices having less than 36 revenue units.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall exclude from the revenue credited to a post office for the purposes of this section money received at that office for—

"(1) setting meters for patrons beyond the area served by the office unless authorized by the Department;

"(2) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold in large or unusual quantities to be used in mailing matter at other offices; and

"(3) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold for mailing matter diverted from other offices and mailing of matter so diverted without stamps affixed.

"(c) Whenever unusual conditions prevail at a post office of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate class based on his estimate of the number of revenue units which the office will have during the succeeding twelve months. Any office so advanced need not be relegated to a lower class before the end of the second fiscal year after the advancement. At that time, the office shall be assigned to the appropriate class in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section.".

SEC. 106. Section 704 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting "of the first, second, or third class" appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "(other than one for which the postmaster furnishes quarters, equipment, and fixtures on an allowance basis)".

SEC. 107. Subsection (b) (1) of section 2102 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) for post offices at which the postmaster does not furnish quarters on an allowance basis;".

SEC. 108. (a) Section 3501 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) deleting from the first sentence of subsection (a) the following: "standard positions of postmasters in a fourth-class office and rural carrier" and inserting in lieu thereof "standard position of rural carrier"; and

(2) inserting a new subsection (c) following subsection (b) as follows:

"(c) The Postmaster General shall determine and, effective at the beginning of the first pay period in each calendar year, shall adjust the rankings of all positions for which the number of annual revenue units of a post office or its class is a relevant factor of the ranking, using the revenue units of the preceding fiscal year and the class in which the office will be placed at the beginning of the next fiscal year. The Postmaster General also may adjust rankings of such positions at other times of the year based upon substantial changes in service conditions.".

(b) Chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (c) of section 3513—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POST OFFICE CLERK. (KP-4)"; and

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

(B) Add the following new sentence to the end of paragraph (1): "This office has less than 190 revenue units annually.".

(2) In subsection (e) of section 3516—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-18)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $1,700" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 40 revenue units annually".

(3) In subsection (b) of section 3517—

(A) Chance the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-20)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $4,700" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 110 revenue units annually".

(4) In subsection (b) of section 3518—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-22)";

(B) Delete "third class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $6,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 140 revenue units annually".

(5) In subsection (b) of section 3519—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-24)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $63,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,490 revenue units annually".

(6) In subsection (c) of section 3519—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-25)";

(B) Delete "second class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of approximately $16,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 380 revenue units annually".

(7) In subsection (b) of section 3520—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-27)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delte "annual receipts of approximately $63,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,490 revenue units annually".

(8) In subsection (b) of section 3521—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-29)";

(B) Delete "first class" appearing in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $129,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 3,060 revenue units annually".

(9) In subsection (b) of section 3522—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-31)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $314,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 7,450 revenue units annually".

(10) In subsection (b) of section 3523—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-33)";

(B) Delete "first class" appearing in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof: "This office has approximately 110 employees, approximately 14,350 revenue units annually, 13 government-owned vehicle units, one classified station and 42 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.".

(11) In subsection (b) of section 3524—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-35)"; and

(B) Delte "annual receipts of $2,700,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof approximately 64,000 revenue units annually".

(12) In subsection (c) of section 3524—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-36)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $1,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 23,700 revenue units annually".

(13) In subsection (a) of section 3525—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-37)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $8,460,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 200,000 revenue units annually."

(14) In subsection (b) of section 3525—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-38)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $2,700,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 64,000 revenue units annually".

(15) In subsection (a) of section 3526—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-39)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $16,900,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 400,000 revenue units annually".

(16) In subsection (b) of section 3526—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-40)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $4,470,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 106,000 revenue units annually".

(17) In subsection (b) of section 3527—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-42)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $48,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,000,000 revenue units annually".

(18) In subsection (c) of section 3527—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-43)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $8,460,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 200,000 revenue units annually".

(19) In subsection (b) of section 3528—

(A) Change the catchline to read "ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP-45)"; and

(B) Delete "annual receipts of $140,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 2,500,000 revenue units annually".

(20) In subsection (c) of section 3528—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-46)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $16,900,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 400,000 revenue units annually".

(21) In section 3529—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-47)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of 48,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately 1,000,000 revenue units annually."

(22) In section 3530—

(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP-48)";

(B) Delete "first class" in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

(C) Delete "annual receipts of $140,000,000" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof "approximately equal to 2,500,000 revenue units annually".

SEC. 109. Subsection (a) of section 3542 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) deleting "sections 3543 and 3544" from the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3543"; and

(2) amending the Postal Field Service Schedule II to read as follows:

"POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE II

"(To be effective for the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, and thereafter)

PFS	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$3,945	$4,075	$4,205	$4,335	$4,465	$4,595	$4,725	$4,855	$4,985	$5,115	$5,245	$5,375
2	4,270	4,410	4,550	4,690	4,830	4,970	5,110	5,250	5,390	5,530	5,670	5,810
3	4,615	4,770	4,925	5,080	5,235	5,390	5,545	5,700	5,855	5,910	6,065	6,220
4	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,155	6,320	6,485	6,650	6,815
5	5,345	5,525	5,705	5,885	6,065	6,245	6,425	6,605	6,785	6,965	7,145	7,325
6	5,735	5,925	6,115	6,305	6,495	6,685	6,875	7,065	7,255	7,445	7,635	7,825
7	6,140	6,345	6,550	6,755	6,960	7,165	7,370	7,575	7,780	7,985	8,190	.....
8	6,650	6,870	7,090	7,310	7,530	7,750	7,970	8,190	8,410	8,630	.....	.....
9	7,190	7,430	7,670	7,910	8,150	8,390	8,630	8,870	9,110	9,350	.....	.....
10	7,830	8,095	8,360	8,625	8,890	9,155	9,420	9,685	9,950	10,215	.....	.....
11	8,650	8,945	9,240	9,535	9,830	10,125	10,420	10,715	11,010	11,305	.....	.....
12	9,570	9,895	10,220	10,545	10,870	11,195	11,520	11,845	12,170	12,495	.....	.....
13	10,575	10,940	11,305	11,670	12,035	12,400	12,765	13,130	13,495	13,860	.....	.....
14	11,660	12,065	12,470	12,875	13,280	13,685	14,090	14,495	14,900	15,305	.....	.....
15	12,885	13,330	13,775	14,220	14,665	15,110	15,555	16,000	16,445	16,890	.....	.....
16	14,240	14,735	15,230	15,725	16,220	16,715	17,210	17,705	18,200	18,695	.....	.....
17	15,755	16,305	16,855	17,405	17,955	18,505	19,055	19,605	20,155	20,705	.....	.....
18	17,450	18,060	18,670	19,280	19,890	20,500	21,110	21,720	22,330	22,940	.....	.....
19	19,345	20,030	20,695	21,370	22,045	22,720	23,395	24,070	.....	.....	.....	.....
20	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	....."

SEC. 110. In subsection (a) of section 3543 of title 39, United States Code, the Rural Carrier Schedule II is amended to read as follows:

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE II

"(To be effective for the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, and thereafter)

	"Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carriers in rural delivery service:												
Fixed compensation per annum	$2,240	$2,345	$2,450	$2,555	$2,660	$2,765	$2,870	$2,975	$3,080	$3,185	$3,290	$3,395
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25".

SEC. 111. (a) Section 3544 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3544. Compensation of Postmasters at Fourth-Class Offices

"(a) The Postmaster General shall rank the position of postmasters of fourth-class offices in level 5 of the Postal Field Service Schedule and shall establish the annual rate of basic compensation for each such position in the proportion of the annual rate of basic compensation for positions in PFS–5 which he determines, in consideration of the postal needs of the patrons of the office, that the postmaster's hours of service bear to full-time service. Determinations made by the Postmaster General under this subsection shall be final and conclusive until changed by him.

"(b) Persons who perform the duties of postmaster at a post office of the fourth class where there is a vacancy or during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave or leave without pay shall be compensated at the rate of basic compensation for PFS level 5, step 1, determined in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) At seasonal post offices of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may authorize the payment of basic salary prorated over the pay periods the office is open for business during the fiscal year.

"(d) When required by the Postmaster General a postmaster at a fourth-class office shall, and any other postmaster in PFS level 5 when permitted by the Postmaster General may, furnish quarters, fixtures, and equipment for an office on an allowance basis. The allowance for this purpose shall be an amount equal to 15 per centum of the basic compensation for the postmaster at the office computed on the basis of the first step of PFS level 5.".

(b) In the operation of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section, the following provisions shall govern:

(1) Each postmaster at a fourth-class office on the effective date of this section shall be assigned, as of such date,—

(A) to that numerical step of level 5 of Postal Field Service Schedule II (PFS II–5) which corresponds to the numerical step of the Fourth-Class Office Schedule (FOS) receipts category which he occupied immediately prior to such assignment, or

(B) to the lowest step of level 5 of Postal Field Service Schedule II (PFS II–5) which will provide him, for the number of hours of service determined under section 3544 of title 39, United States Code, compensation which is not less than the compensation to which he would otherwise be entitled, on the effective date of this section, under Fourth Class Schedule II (as if such schedule were in effect on such date),

whichever step provides the higher rate of compensation.

(2) If no step in level 5 of Postal Field Service Schedule II (PFS II–5) will provide a postmaster, so assigned under paragraph (1) of this subsection, with compensation which is equal to or greater than the compensation which he would have received under Fourth Class Schedule II (as if such schedule were in effect on the effective date of this section), as provided by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 712 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, as amended, such postmaster shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the applicable rate fixed under Fourth Class Schedule II (as if such schedule were in effect on the effective date of this section) and the provisions of section 3544 of title 39, United States Code (as such provisions existed immediately prior to the effective date of this section), in the manner provided by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 712 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, as amended. Subject to the provisions of section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, the compensation of a postmaster paid in accordance with the immediately preceding sentence shall be adjusted in accordance with changes in the gross postal receipts of his post office as though this Act had not been enacted. The compensation of a postmaster paid in accordance with any of the foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall continue in effect until such postmaster is entitled to receive compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law.

(3) If changes in the gross postal receipts category or changes in salary step otherwise would occur on the effective date of this section (without regard to the enactment of this section), such changes shall be held and considered to have occurred prior to assignment under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(c) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting:

"3544. Fourth Class Office Schedule.";

and inserting in lieu thereof

"3544. Compensation of Postmasters at Fourth-Class Offices.".

SEC. 112. (a) Subsection (a) of section 6007 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Postmaster General shall pay to persons, other than special delivery messengers at post offices of the first class, for making delivery of special delivery mail such fees as may be established by him not in excess of the special delivery fee.".

(b) Section 2009 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting "at any price less than eight cents per piece" and inserting in lieu thereof "at any price less than the fees established pursuant to section 6007 of this title.".

SEC. 113. Section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by deleting from subsection (a) "(3) gross receipts category, with respect to the Fourth-Class Office Schedule" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3) minimum hours of service with respect to postmasters in fourth-class post offices"; and

(2) by deleting from subsection (f) "(1) reductions in class or gross receipts category of any post office, or" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) reductions in class, revenue units of any post office, or the minimum hours of service for a fourth-class post office, or".

SEC. 114. (a) Section 711 of title 39, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) Section 3552(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) (1) Each employee of the Postal Field Service Schedule and each employee subject to the Rural Carrier Schedule who has not reached the highest step for his position shall be advanced successively to the next higher step as follows:

"(A) To steps 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of fifty-two calendar weeks of satisfactory service; and

"(B) To steps 8 and above—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of satisfactory service.

"(2) The receipt of an equivalent increase during any of the waiting periods specified in this subsection shall cause a new full waiting period to commence for further step increases."

(c) Section 3541(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out "postmasters," in paragraph (3) thereof; and

(2) adding immediately following paragraph (5) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) To compute the daily rate of basic compensation for postmasters, the annual rate of compensation shall be divided by 260."

(d) Chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"§ 3577. Postmasters

"Postmasters shall be scheduled to work a five-day week except upon determination by the Postmaster General that a workweek in excess of five days for the postmaster of a particular post office is necessary to maintain essential postal service in the public interest. The provisions of this section shall not be applied to require the closing of any post office on any weekday, Monday through Saturday inclusive."

(e) Section 3552 of title 39, United States Code, relating to automatic advancement by step increases of postal field service employees, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title and in addition to advancement under other provisions of this section, each employee in levels 1 through 6 of the Postal Field Service Schedule, each employee subject to the Rural Carrier Schedule, and each employee subject to the Fourth Class Office Schedule, who—

"(1) on October 13, 1962, had performed at least one thousand and ninety-two weeks of satisfactory service and who has not attained step 12 of the step rates of his position shall be placed in step 12;

"(2) on October 13, 1962, had performed at least nine hundred and thirty-six weeks of satisfactory service but less than one thousand and ninety-two weeks of satisfactory service and who has not attained step 11 of the step rates of his position shall be placed in step 11;

"(3) on October 13, 1962, had performed at least seven hundred and eighty weeks of satisfactory service but less than nine hundred and thirty-six weeks of satisfactory service and who has not attained step 10 of the step rates of his position shall be placed in step 10;

"(4) on October 13, 1962, had performed at least six hundred and twenty-four weeks of satisfactory service but less than seven hundred and eighty weeks of satisfactory service and who has not attained step 9 of the step rates of his position shall be placed in step 9;

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"(5) on October 13, 1962, had performed at least four hundred and sixty-eight weeks of satisfatcory service but less than six hundred and twenty-four weeks of satisfactory service and who has not attained step 8 of the step rates of his position shall be placed in step 8;

"(6) on October 13, 1962, had performed at least three hundred and sixty-four weeks of satisfactory service but less than four hundred and sixty-eight weeks of satisfactory service and who has not attained step 7 of the step rates of his position shall be placed in step 7;

"(7) on October 13, 1962, had performed at least two hundred and sixty weeks of satisfactory service but less than three hundred and sixty-four weeks of satisfactory service and who has not attained step 6 of the step rates of his position shall be placed in step 6;

"(8) on October 13, 1962, had performed at least one hundred and fifty-six weeks of satisfatcory service but less than two hundred and sixty weeks of satisfactory service and who has not attained step 5 of the step rates of his position shall be placed in step 5;

"(9) on October 13, 1962, had performed at least one hundred and four weeks of satisfactory service but less than one hundred and fifty-six weeks of satisfactory service and who has not attained step 4 of the step rates of his position shall be placed in step 4; and

"(10) on October 13, 1962, had performed at least fifty-two weeks of satisfactory service but less than one hundred and four weeks of satisfactory service and who has not attained step 3 of the step rates of his position shall be placed in step 3.

Service in excess of the minimum service required for placement in a step under this subsection shall be credited toward service required for placement in the next higher step under this subsection."

(f) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting

"3577. Postmasters."

immediately following

"3576. Holiday service of rural carriers and employees assigned to road duty."

(g) The table of contents of chapter 7 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting

"711. Method of determining gross receipts.".

SEC. 115. The first sentence of section 712 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 856) is amended by striking out "The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule II, Rural Carrier Schedule II, or Fourth Class Office Schedule II, as the case may be, on the effective date of such schedule shall be determined as follows:" and by inserting in lieu thereof, "Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 504 of this Act and section 111(b) of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1963, the basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule II or Rural Carrier Schedule II, as the case may be, on the effective date of such schedule shall be determined as follows:".

SEC. 116. (a) Section 712 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 856) is amended by adding a new paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"(3) Notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary, an existing rate of compensation fixed by reason of section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, relating to salary protection upon reduction in salary standing, shall be increased by an amount equal to the amount of increase in such rate made by the applicable Schedule II".

(b) Schedule 713 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 856) is hereby repealed with respect to the increases in rates of compensation made by Postal Field Service Schedule II and Rural Carrier Schedule II as contained in the amendments made by sections 109 and 110 of this Act and with respect to the increases in rates of compensation pursuant to this subsection.

EMPLOYEES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 117. (a) Section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the appointment and annual salaries of certain staff positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director

"(a) The Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the following—

"(1) The Chief Medical Director, who shall be the Chief of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and shall be directly responsible to the Administrator for the operations of the Department. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator. Section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), shall not apply to any individual appointed Chief Medical Director before January 1, 1964; but section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a), shall apply, in accordance with its terms, to any such individual.

"(2) The Deputy Chief Medical Director, who shall be the principal assistant of the Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

"(3) Not to exceed five Assistant Chief Medical Directors, who shall be appointed by the Administrator upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director. One Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine who shall be directly responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Dental Service.

"(4) Such Medical Directors as may be appointed by the Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, to suit the needs of the Department. A Medical Director shall be either a qualified doctor of medicine or a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine.

"(5) A Director of Nursing Service, who shall be a qualified registered nurse, appointed by the Administrator, and who shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Nursing Service.

"(6) A Chief Pharmacist and a Chief Dietitian, appointed by the Administrator.

"(7) Such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by this chapter.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any appointment under this section shall be for a period of four years, with reappointment permissible for successive like periods, except that persons so appointed or reappointed shall be subject to removal by the Administrator for cause.

"(c) The Administrator may designate a member of the Chaplain Service of the Veterans' Administration as Director, Chaplain Service, for a period of two years, subject to removal by the Administrator for cause. Redesignation under this subsection may be made for successive like periods. An individual designated as Director, Chaplain Service, shall at the end of his period of service as Director revert to the position, grade, and status which he held immediately prior to being designated Director, Chaplain Service, and all service as Director, Chaplain Service, shall be creditable as service in the former position.".

(b) The table of contents of chapter 73, title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"4103. Appointments and compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director.".

SEC. 118. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"SECTION 4103 SCHEDULE

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, $24,500.

"Medical Director, $21,445 minimum to $24,445 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Director, Chaplain Service, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"PHYSICIAN AND DENTIST SCHEDULE

"Director grade, $18,935 minimum to $24,175 maximum.

"Executive grade, $17,655 minimum to $23,190 maximum.

"Chief grade, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"Senior grade, $14,170 minimum to $18,580 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $12,075 minimum to $15,855 maximum.

"Full grade, $10,200 minimum to $13,395 maximum.

"Associate grade, $8,550 minimum to $11,205 maximum.

"NURSE SCHEDULE

"Assistant Director grade, $14,170 minimum to $18,580 maximum.

"Chief grade, $12,075 minimum to $15,855 maximum.

"Senior grade, $10,200 minimum to $13,395 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $8,550 minimum to $11,205 maximum.

"Full grade, $7,210 minimum to $9,415 maximum.

"Associate grade, $6,315 minimum to $8,215 maximum.

"Junior grade, $5,505 minimum to $7,170 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position.".

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS; STAFF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

SEC. 119. Section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows:

"FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

"SEC. 412. There shall be 10 classes of Foreign Service officers, including the classes of career ambassador and of career minister. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be at the rate provided by law for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be at the rate provided by law for level V of such schedule. Effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, the per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"Class 1	$22,650	$23,440	$24,500				
Class 2	18,295	18,930	19,565	$20,200	$20,835	$21,470	$22,105
Class 3	14,860	15,375	15,890	16,405	16,920	17,435	17,950
Class 4	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595
Class 5	9,900	10,245	10,590	10,935	11,280	11,625	11,970
Class 6	8,205	8,490	8,775	9,060	9,345	9,630	9,915
Class 7	7,000	7,235	7,470	7,705	7,940	8,175	8,410
Class 8	6,050	6,250	6,450	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250".

SEC. 120. Subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There shall be ten classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees. Effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, the per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$14,860	$15,375	$15,890	$16,405	$16,920	$17,435	$17,950	$18,465	$18,980	$19,495
Class 2	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
Class 3	9,900	10,245	10,590	10,935	11,280	11,625	11,970	12,315	12,660	13,005
Class 4	8,205	8,490	8,775	9,060	9,345	9,630	9,915	10,200	10,485	10,770
Class 5	7,405	7,660	7,915	8,170	8,425	8,680	8,935	9,190	9,445	9,700
Class 6	6,710	6,935	7,160	7,385	7,610	7,835	8,060	8,285	8,510	8,735
Class 7	6,205	6,410	6,615	6,820	7,025	7,230	7,435	7,640	7,845	8,050
Class 8	5,490	5,675	5,860	6,045	6,230	6,415	6,600	6,785	6,970	7,155
Class 9	5,010	5,175	5,340	5,505	5,670	5,835	6,000	6,165	6,330	6,495
Class 10	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830".

SEC. 121. Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this Act at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION COUNTY COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 122. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102 for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 123. Section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 1173) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The rate of basic compensation, established under this section, and received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of a statutory increase in the compensation schedules of the salary systems specified in subsection (a) shall be initially adjusted on the effective date of such new compensation schedules in accordance with conversion rules and regulations prescribed by the President or by such agency or agencies as he may designate."

Mr. MURRAY (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of title I be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8986) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CIVIL RIGHTS

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House an extremely worthwhile project presently being undertaken by the members of the Montgomery, Ala., Junior Chamber of Commerce. They, along with numerous Members of Congress, feel that the people of the United States generally are not thoroughly familiar with the provisions of the pending civil rights bill. For this reason, the Montgomery Junior Chamber of Commerce has printed a booklet, entitled "The Truth." In addition to the text of the bill, the booklet contains a resolution by the Montgomery Jaycees and a short analysis of the bill by two former presidents of the American Bar Association, Lloyd Wright and John C. Satterfield.

These follow:

A RESOLUTION (PASSED BY THE MONTGOMERY JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, FEBRUARY 18, 1964)

Whereas there is now pending for consideration before the U.S. Senate the Civil Rights Act of 1963; and

Whereas included in this act as title VII is the establishment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; and

Whereas the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission shall be empowered under the provisions of this act with authority to usurp all the constitutional rights of management in the selection, promotion, and firing of its employees through constant Government supervision; and

Whereas included in this act as title II is the section covering public accommodations which empowers the Federal Government to supervise business enterprises which are privately owned in their choice of customers, clients, guests, or clientele; and

Whereas such unprecedented power being placed in the hands of any governmental agency, whether it be local, State or Federal level, violates every principle contained in our free enterprise system and relationship between a government and its people; and

Whereas the national creed of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce contains as its core the principle "that economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise"; and

Whereas the preservation of our free enterprise system is our greatest weapon in the fight against communistic collectivism and should be preserved at all cost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That every member of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce who subscribes to and believes in this principle as pronounced in the national creed should endeavor with all his effort and ability to bring about the defeat of titles II and VII of this act and to prevent the creation of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That every jaycee chapter which sincerely and honestly subscribes to the national creed should awaken the people of its community to this danger to our economic system; and be it further

Resolved, That every responsible American should read and study this proposed legislation and every jaycee chapter should endeavor to make available the truth concerning this unconstitutional invasion of all our property rights.

AN ANALYSIS BY LLOYD WRIGHT AND JOHN C. SATTERFIELD, PAST PRESIDENTS OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Attorney General Robert Kennedy is now urging Congress to pass a package of legislation called the Civil Rights Act of 1963. Its title is a misnomer. This bill is but 10 percent civil rights. The rest—90 percent—is an extension of Federal executive power created at the expense of individuals, States, and municipalities. It is, in fact, the blueprint for a controlled system of life, more drastic than all such legislation ever passed.

Consider the bill's principal provisions:

Under the cloak of civil rights—if this bill becomes law the Federal Government henceforth will dictate to whom you may sell or rent your home.

If you are the proprietor of an establishment that offers goods and services for use or hire—not just public accommodations (hotels, restaurants, and such) but any kind of business that offers anything to the public—then, under this bill, your business would be subject to Federal control.

In like manner, the bill covers all contractors and subcontractors in every program or activity where direct or indirect financial aid is rendered by the Government. In the sense of this bill, you are a contractor (or subcontractor) if you borrow money from or deposit money in a Government-insured bank (FDIC); if you have a FHA, VA, or Small Business Administration Loan; if you are a realtor or developer; if you are a farmer who has financial dealings with the Farm Credit Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the Soil Conservation Service or if you have Federal Crop Insurance; if you deal with REA or participate in any agricultural program involving Federal funds; if you have financial dealings, direct or indirect with any of these agencies, you will come under Federal control.

Under this act, all employers who participate in any of these programs can be told by a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC) whom they shall hire, fire, promote and demote, and how they shall handle their employees.

Under this act, simple "integration" will no longer suffice. If it becomes law, a Federal inspector may render a finding that racial or religious imbalance exists in a business. Thereafter, that business could not employ or promote those people it preferred but only "racial" or "religious" individuals in such quantity as the Federal inspector designated. His ruling would apply to all job classifications: To common laborers, to the secretarial staff, to supervisory employees, and to vice presidents, all alike. Federal administrative personnel would be prosecutors, judge, jury and executioner.

Enforcement of the Federal inspector's findings would be simple. Failure to comply would mean the end of all participation in Federal programs. Your loan could be called, you could be blacklisted for further

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

loans from banks and financial institutions insured by the Government, and you could be prevented from taking part in any activity that had to do with Federal financing. In certain situations, an employer would be jailed without trial by jury.

And that is only part of it.

The Civil Rights Act of 1963 would also bring under Federal control individuals and businesses never before thought to be constitutionally subject to such regulation. For instance, under the bill's title II, any person who pays a business license to a State or municipality could be included.

Thus, the act brings in almost every profession and every business—lawyers, realtors, doctors, small establishments, theaters, restaurants, gasolines stations, hotels, motels and lodging houses—and the Federal control will never end.

It goes even further. If this act should become law, between 100 and 200 statutes now in effect would be amended. Everyone who had dealings with Federal education programs, for instance, would be subject to its force. Under the provisions of the act, the U.S. Commissioner of Education could force the transfer of children from one school to another—back-and-forth—until racial balance and religious balance existed. Then, if "imbalance" should recur, the process could be repeated, ad infinitum, so that your child would have no assurance of school continuity.

Under the authority given in connection with Federal financing, school lunch programs, research programs, the building of schools, Hill-Burton hospitals—all such programs and organizations would be subject to Federal political manipulation.

As applied to schools, there would certainly be claimed to exist—and the claim doubtless would be upheld—the Government's rights to find that if a teacher taught race or anthropological history contrary to the Federal Government's policy, then such instruction could be halted and the teacher fired. And if the books being used were not to the Federal Government's liking, the Government could stop their use. Which is another way of saying that the Federal Government proposes under the Civil Rights Act of 1963—to take over the education of our children. Thought control of future generations would be an accomplished fact.

Nor is that all. The principal step to unfettered dictatorship is incorporated in this bill, that is, control of the electoral machinery.

In 1961, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights recommended—contrary to express provisions in the Constitution—that the Federal Government control the qualifications and registration of voters, the holding of electors, the counting of votes, the fixing of voting and electoral districts. The Civil Rights Act of 1963 would put the first two of these recommendations into effect.

It follows, then, a politically minded attorney general could go into an area where the voting might be close and, if this act becomes law, he could file suit, make certain allegations, and—without proof that his allegations were true—register tens of thousands of voters. The ballots would be cast, and the votes counted and the election won, even though the attorney general's act, later, was determined by the courts to have been invalid. Then at the next election, he could repeat the whole operation.

It goes on: In giving the Federal Government control in the hiring, firing, promoting, and demoting, and payment of employees, the act also gives the Federal Government power to destroy not only the seniority system of unions, but also an employee's rights within the company for which he works. This is so because the act gives full and unlimited power to Federal inspectors to determine who sh[all] be hired, promoted, demoted, or fired, w[henever] a charge is made that racial and or [religious] imbalance (discrimination) exists.

The [Civil Rights Act of 1963, as can be] seen, d[estroys everything that we have be]lieved, [heretofore, to protect us from the] comple[te and absolute power of a Central] Govern[ment. It is something that strikes] at the [heart of every parent of school-age] childre[n, at every businessman, at every] profess[ional man, at every homeowner, and] at ever[y wage earner in the United States.

Many [of the provisions of the act are con]trary [to the Constitution of the United] States—[are true. They are also contrary to] existing [decisions of the Supreme Court of] the Uni[ted States. But, no one can foretell] what [the Supreme Court would hold, if] Congre[ss makes a "legislative finding" in] the are[as mentioned. That is, if the Civil] Rights [Act of 1963 is passed by Congress.

The [Montgomery Advertiser in an edi]torial [dated February 25, 1964, made the] follow[ing comments on the efforts of the] Montg[omery Jaycees "to wake Amer]icans [up to the provisions of the pending] civil r[ights bill":

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, Feb. 25, 1964]

WAKE UP

The [Montgomery Junior Chamber of Com]merce [has undertaken a civic duty of mag]nitude [the same being to wake Americans] up to [the provisions of the pending civil] rights [bill. Along with the Advertiser, our] jaycee[s do not believe the people are gen]erally [informed about this law designed to] recons[truct America.

The [jaycees are seeking, not State, but] nation[al distribution of the bill as passed] by the [House. The 10-cent booklet, entitled] "The [Truth," contains the bill and a short] analys[is by two former presidents of the] Ameri[can Bar Association, Lloyd Wright and] John [C. Satterfield.

The [distribution effort is on—for example,] a cop[y has been mailed to the president of] all th[e Civitan Clubs in the country and] 600 ed[itors—and the jaycees are eager for] new d[istribution devices.

The [jaycees, we predict, will find their] efforts [rewarded by eager response as the] people [in the North, East, and West learn] that t[he bill applies to their private interests] just a[s it does to those in the South.

The[re] is a visible stirring in the country over [t]eglastic race-mixing jihads. For example [in] Brooklyn civic groups representing 7[5],000 people will demonstrate against busin[g] children across town from Brooklyn to Ha[rlem] simply to achieve intermingling. This [white] demonstration is designed to counte[r] the Negro demonstrations and is obvio[usly] a development of consequence.

The [syndicated columnists, Rowland Evans] and [Robert Novak, are pointing out that] one [of the country's keenest politicians] senses [the revolt. Richard Nixon, in a Lin]coln [Day address, bluntly said that "ex]tremi[sts" are generating "an atmosphere of] hate [and distrust."

Ob[viously Nixon recognizes that GOLD]WATE[R has been on the right track all the] time [and he seeks to wrest the nomination] from [him by stealing his thunder.

In [Tacoma last week the people stood up] with [a roar in behalf of their property rights.] They [voted 4 to 1 to nullify an open-housing] ordin[ance.

In [Seattle, the city council ducked the] incre[asingly hot issue. It made the issue] subje[ct to a March 10 election.

La[st week in Seattle's primary election for] mayo[r, the winner was Dorm Braman, a Repub]li[can and the only candidate to state] open[ly that he was against an open-housing] ordi[nance.

Democratic politicians in California are saying that in the prospective statewide referendum late this year, citizens may vote as high as 2 to 1 to repeal the occupancy law.

The provisions in the national civil rights bill strike in all directions and strike harder. If enough Americans learn that the bill affects almost everybody, it will be nailed.

CITIZENS OF 39TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK VOICE THEIR VIEWS

(Mr. PILLION asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.)

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House and of the Senate, the views of the citizenry of the 39th Congressional District of New York on questions of major concern to this Congress and this Nation.

On February 3, I mailed to every household of the district a questionnaire and memorandum—a total of 122,000. The memorandum was intended to give the basic facts and background of the major and pressing problems confronting Congress.

The questionnaire contained 40 questions. The purpose of this opinion survey is:

First. To determine, in broad terms, the attitudes and opinions of the constituency on vital current domestic and international issues.

Second. To stimulate public interest and discussion, on the part of the public, for the strengthening, unifying, and bettering of this Nation and its peoples.

Third. To give to each citizen as great and as direct a voice as possible in their Federal Government, and in the decisions that so greatly affect their future.

Fourth. To make available to the Members of the U.S. Congress, and to the responsible officials of the executive branch, the views of the citizens of the 39th Congressional District.

A total of 10,154 questionnaires were completed and returned. This remarkable response is proof that the citizens of the 39th Congressional District are deeply concerned with this Nation's, and the world's problems. It also evidences their willingness to assume the responsibilities of citizenship in a free country.

I am, personally, most grateful to those persons who generously took the time and trouble to complete and return the questionnaire. About two-thirds of these questionnaires contained additional comments or attached letters explaining or expanding upon either the questions or upon other issues. I deeply appreciate and respect their valuable suggestions and views.

The 39th Congressional District contains in it a small part of the city of Buffalo, about one-half of the city of Lackawanna and 23 towns around the city of Buffalo. The district contains urban, suburban, and rural areas. Its composition is a fair cross section of the Nation. The answers would be fairly representative for the Nation's population.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

MAA program has no relative responsibility clause, nor property lien clause, it does limit personal property including the case value of life insurance. It is my feeling that the principal reason keeping older persons from applying for this public assistance is their unwillingness to experience the feeling of shame, loss of dignity, and invasion of privacy associated with the means test.

Indicative of this, is a recent article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun regarding a meeting between the City Health Commissioner Dr. Farber, and officials of the medical profession, regarding how to reach over 8,000 people in Baltimore whom, it was thought, needed MAA assistance, but had not applied for the program. The medical profession's answer to this problem is to shift the means test from the welfare department to the health department, and somehow through this magic formula eliminate the objections of our proud oldsters.

This same article discusses the problem of "urging more doctors to accept aged patients in the program." Evidently, problems have arisen regarding MAA beneficiaries who could not locate physicians to care for them in some parts of Baltimore. In order to correct this situation, I have been informed that the Baltimore City Medical Society has circulated a memo to its members, urging them to participate in the MAA program, and stating that while it (MAA) may not be perfect, it is better than the socialistic alternative now before Congress.

Another shortcoming of the MAA program as it operates in Maryland is the practice whereby MAA patients admitted to hospitals for treatment become staff patients and thereby lose their choice of physicians. Their regular physician can care for them in the hospital only if he agrees not to receive payment for his services.

In fairness to members of the medical profession, it should be noted that they are supporting efforts being made to liberalize the MAA program by the addition of nursing home care which is not presently available and by more flexible income limitations. As in other States, however, the realities of the demands on a State budget sometimes force a delay in needed programs. In the recent session of the Maryland General Assembly, the State health department recommended the inclusion of flexible income limits for the chronically ill, and increased dental and eyeglass care under the MAA program and requested $150,000 in State funds to pay for these improvements, but unfortunately, this item was deleted from the budget.

The question which, of course, arises is why can't the State of Maryland be more liberal in their standards of eligibility and also in the extent to which they meet the costs of these health services, especially for the poverty stricken. The fact is many of the States, including Maryland, are making a real effort to provide more medical care for the aged. But, the burden is heavy and the extent to which they can go—in the judgment of the State officials—has real limits. Mrs. Margaret Schweinhaut, chairman of Maryland Commission on Aging, noted recently that 4 years ago, the State appropriated $3½ million for hospital care of the indigent; last year, it appropriated $11 million for this purpose. And this cannot be the end to increased costs.

Mrs. Schweinhaut referred to the hospital costs analysis survey made by the Hospital Council of Maryland which indicated the present cost of hospitalization for one person per day now averages $35.34, a rise of $4.25 in 1 year. All States, including Maryland, are confronted with the need for increased appropriations in the face of their limited sources of revenue. These costs are increasing despite the large share provided by the Federal Government in meeting medical aid to the aged costs.

If the King-Anderson bill is enacted, Maryland and other States would not be burdened by these millions of dollars in State costs and all their senior citizens who needed these services could avail themselves of these benefits. In addition, the elimination of the "needs test" under the social insurance proposal would eliminate most of the burdensome costs of administration and do away with the need of a bureaucracy compelled under present circumstances to invade the privacy of our senior citizens.

In discussing the circumstances of the aged in the first three categories I established earlier, I would like to focus on one particular aspect of the bill I do not believe has been given the importance it merits in the discussions thus far. This is the provision in the King-Anderson bill for up to 180 days of nursing home care and up to 240 visits for home health care which would meet the needs of many elderly patients at a low cost.

Few elderly people can meet the costs of nursing home out of their own incomes. Nationally, 3 out of 4 elderly families and 9 out of 10 elderly individuals would be unable to pay as much as $250 monthly for nursing home care.

The actual costs in Maryland for nursing home care are higher than $250. The average cost for an indlivdual in a skilled nursing home in Maryland would be closer to $350 a month.

For those on public assistance (OAA) Maryland now pays $135 a month for routine care in a nursing home, somewhat more if special attention is required. For example, if the patient needs to be fed, Maryland will pay from $6 to $8 daily, or about $200 a month. Most operators of nursing homes maintain that these payments do not meet the full costs. As I mentioned earlier, the MAA program does not provide any payments for nursing home care so this is a serious gap in the program.

What about private insurance? Under the Maryland Hospital Service Blue Cross plan, a person is entitled to 70 days of hospital care and/or 2 days of nursing home care for each hospital day not used. Of course, the premium for this policy is over $260 per year putting it beyond the reach of many of our elderly citizens. Certainly such costs would be very difficult to meet for those individuals with incomes under $1,500 per year and would be equally difficult for those couples with incomes under $3,000.

Of the two nationwide insurance companies covering the largest number of aged policyholders, one, the Continental Casualty, does not provide nursing home expenses at all, and the other, Mutual of Omaha, provides $5 a day for 55 days.

Although I have stressed the factors of poverty among the aged and the nursing home provision, it should be clear that I support all the provisions in the King-Anderson bill for the benefit of all of our elderly citizens.

I am not impressed by the argument that a small fraction of wealthy persons among those of age 65 and over who could pay for their own medical costs would come under the provisions of this bill. They need not avail themselves of the benefits if they are opposed in principle.

In any case, they are equally entitled to the protection of such legislation, if enacted, as they are entitled to equal treatment in the courts, and police protection against threats to persons and property. All of us, not only the present aged, face the prospects of ill health if we live into the later years. It is a common danger that needs to be met by nationwide measures.

At present it is said with much truth that only the very poor and the very rich can get the wide range of basic health services they need.

The average elderly person in our country who has worked, raised a family, paid taxes, throughout his working years, has earned the right to be helped when in his old age, he needs such help. The younger generation certainly prefers to provide for the future now rather than become a charity case in the future. Let us pass legislation on behalf of both groups; let us pass this long overdue legislation this year.

Put the Brakes On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Economist newspaper chain in Chicago, last Wednesday, March 4, directed its readers' attention to the size of Federal and State gasoline taxes, as well as to the key question of whether the taxpayers are being intelligently served by the highway expansion program.

There are many questions to be answered at this stage of our Federal-State highway program, and it would be well for us to review them at this midpoint, so that the taxpayers might be spared the cost of duplication or unnecessary facilities, with funds still needed for obvious motor transportation improvements.

I insert the editorial for the attention of the Members:

PUT THE BRAKES ON

In his quarterly report to stockholders and employees of the Standard Oil Co., President John E. Sweringen says that Federal and State gasoline taxes now add 50 percent to the price of gasoline to the consumer.

Gasoline taxes also are paying three-quarters of the present $71 billion program of the 41,000-mile Interstate System of superhighways, he added. Under this program the Federal Government contributes 90 percent of the cost and the States 10 percent.

Now the Illinois Highway Commission, created by the legislature last year, is scheduled to consider recommending a boost in the Illinois gas tax rate from 5 to 7 cents a gallon. Such a boost would cost motorists and truck owners $60 million more than the $270 million they now pay with the 5-cent rate.

Instead of proposing another boost in the rate, the commission should consider ways and means for reducing the cost of highway construction. The Interstate System, when proposed in 1956, was to cost $27.6 billion, but after 5 years the figure was raised to $41 billion. Efforts are underway to expand the system an additional 14,000 miles. That means higher Federal gas tax. Mr. Sweringen observed:

"We strongly support a good highway system in the interest of all citizens, and we agree that gasoline taxes should help pay for the system. But there should be limits, imposed by good judgment. Overly ambitious highway programs can be self-defeating, developing massive problems of maintenance, obsolescence and financing.

"When taxation of a single product—gasoline—has reached the rate of 50 percent, and more is being suggested, American motorists could hardly be blamed for objecting to additional taxes on gasoline or demanding more efficiency and economy in the highway programs they are playing for."

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

With which the motoring public will agree. Building highways that become death traps parallel to toll roads or realining routes only a few years old because special interests want the change, make for waste of funds, as does the condemnation of more land than is needed for grade separations, expressways and similar projects.

The Challenge of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I offer the following prize-winning essay written by my constituent Miss Carol Clark, of Ringgold, Ga. This essay received the first prize in the State of Georgia in a contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The essay follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Carol Clark, Ringgold, Ga.)

Awaken, America. Our world is changing. It is fearful, exciting, challenging. Many doors beckon us, the youth of America. Opportunity seems to be knocking many places at the same time. But we pause to study each entrance, for the door through which we pass must open the storehouse of free thinking; must preserve with vigilance the marvelous fruits of our American way of life. The key to that door is good citizenship.

Good citizenship is the heart of our great country. It is the mystic organ that pumps the lifegiving stream of courage and conviction to nourish the vital organs of liberty. It is the pulse of democracy.

There are many foes that would stop the beat of this heart. One of the most ominous of those is communism—a deadly disease that pollutes the bloodstream of truth and justice. Communism would deafen our ears to the needy cries of the hungry people who look to America for life sustaining aid. It would sever the hand that stretches out in friendship to the oppressed. It would silence the clarion call of the voice of freedom throughout the world. Communism would sap the strength of a healthy body of people who believe implicitly in the individual rights of men.

Indifference is another enemy of good citizenship; indifference to duty, to civic responsibility. We must love our country honestly and unashamed, and actively devote our energies to her. We must stand ready to fight, and, if need be, to die for our country. And, even more important, we must live for her. We, the youth of America, have without effort fallen heir to citizenship. In an incredibly short time we will be voters, we shall choose our leaders. What other country in this whole world has such a precious heritage? It's time for some clear thinking about these responsibilities. We must take a real and active interest in politics and Government affairs. We must dedicate ourselves to our country in whatever profession we serve. Our votes must elect leaders who stand firmly and unquestionably for the principles that have made America the greatest country on earth.

Citizenship is an educated heart. Our Nation calls for the highest knowledge and skill we can attain.

Citizenship is a charitable heart. "And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." America reaches out in compassion to share her wealth with people in all countries of the world. But the merciful hand that holds the bread to starving people can wave the banner of friendship for all to see.

Citizenship is a spiritual heart. "In God We Trust" is more than a slogan on our coins. It is the foundation upon which our country was built. It is a measure of our success as a Nation. High moral and spiritual character is essential. It begins in our homes and is nurtured by our churches and schools. The sanctity of our homes and churches is of the utmost importance.

Citizenship is a flame that glows in the window of freedom. But a flame that is not carefully tended becomes a thing of terror. Fanned by the winds of deceit, prejudice, and hatred, it will consume the sturdy timber of truth and decency, and leave barren the fields of freedom. We must lovingly feed the flame with the fuel of tolerance and understanding, that its beam may serve as a beacon of encouragement for the nations behind the Iron Curtain, and light the way for nations stumbling in the dark to find the safe path to freedom.

Our glorious past is an inspiring record of courage, sacrifice, and bravery. Our future will be what we make of our opportunities today. With God's help, let us work and pray that the heart and soul of America may forever beat loud and clear for freedom and justice for all peoples everywhere.

Federal Salary Increases for Classified and Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a statement made by Secretary-Treasurer John C. Kabachus of the International Association of Fire Fighters in support of the proposed salary increases for classified and postal service employees. John Kabachus is one of the most able men in the trade labor movement. He is respected because of his sound views and good judgment. He has dedicated his life and efforts on behalf of the firefighters of this Nation.

The International Association of Fire Fighters, organized February 28, 1918, representing approximately 115,000 full-time, professional firefighters, wishes to go on record in support of the proposed salary increases for classified and postal service employees.

Because the international represents firefighters who are employed by the Federal Government as well as more than 1,100 municipalities, we are well aware of the inequities that exist between Federal firefighters and firefighters employed by other jurisdictions.

The IAFF Research Department conducts annual surveys on salaries and working conditions of firefighters throughout the United States covering firefighters employed at Federal, State, and private installations and more than 1,200 municipalities, and thus has more information on the salary disparity that exists in this area than any other group.

These data are sources of information for the salaries of firefighters in U.S. cities, as listed in the Municipal Year Book, published by the International City Managers' Association. In addition, these data are used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor.

In support of our position we have compiled the salaries paid to first-class firemen in all cities ranging in population from 100,000 to 150,000 which have responded to our salary and working conditions survey conducted in early 1963. The 100,000 to 150,000 population range was selected because a large proportion of the Federal firefighters are employed at installations or live near metropolitan areas that are within this population range or larger.

Had we included cities above this population range the disparity between salaries of firefighters in municipalities and firefighters employed by the Federal Government would be even greater, due to the fact that there is a tendency for salaries to be higher in larger metropolitan areas. We feel that this is a fair comparison; in fact, we are being quite conservative.

The results of this study indicate that the average city in this population range paid its first-class firefighters $5,534 a year, as of January 1963. This does not include extra pay for service time—longevity rates.

It must be remembered that during the year negotiations take place between local affiliates of the international and the various municipalities. In order to get some idea of the percentage of increase in salaries that has taken place during the past year, the January 1963 salaries were compared with salaries in the same cities of this population group which have thus far responded to our 1964 survey.

Because almost 75 percent of the cities in this population bracket, which have responded to our 1963 survey, have already responded to our current survey, any deviation in the average rate of change for the remaining 25 percent would be so minute that it would have little effect on the average rate of increase that has been computed for the cities which have thus far responded.

We find in our computation that the average rate of increase in salaries of first-class firemen in these cities was approximately 3 percent. When consideration is given to this percentage increase that has taken place during the year, the average city in this population group paid its first-class firefighters $5,700 annually by the end of 1963.

A first-class firefighter in the Federal service is classified at the GS-4 level. The present salary for a grade 4 in the first step is $4,215 or $1,485 below the average salary paid to his counterparts employed by the municipalities.

Because the Federal firefighter is required to work 60 to 72 hours per week, he receives an additional 10 percent of

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

his base pay if he works a 60-hour week or an additional 20 percent if he works a 72-hour week—altogether too little for working overtime. Even if we assume they all received the additional 20 percent of base pay, their total salary in the first step of grade 4 would be $5,058 per year or almost $650 per year less than his counterpart employed by the municipality. At the same time, we must remember that through the efforts of the International Association of Fire Fighters the length of the workweek in the municipality has been reduced considerably, and in the larger metropolitan areas the trend is toward a 48-, 42-, or 40-hour week. When this is taken into consideration, the existing inequity becomes even greater.

The passage of H.R. 8986 would be a move in the direction of reducing not only this inequity but in general the gap that exists between salaries of persons employed by private industry and those employed by the Federal Government.

Let us now turn to some of the responsibilities and requirements of the firefighter's occupation. It is well known that the firefighter is responsible for the protection of human life and property, even at the expense of his own safety.

The National Board of Fire Underwriters, a national organization of capital stock fire insurance companies, which employs a group of experts for establishing standards in fire protection, had this to say of the educational requirements of firefighters:

Fire service cannot remain static; its failure to modernize in equipment or apparatus, or to learn how to combat new fire hazards must, under the laws of progress, result in a retrograding in the service to the public.

A fireman's education must include such features as spontaneous ignition, the probability of flammable gases being liberated, the action of water on certain chemicals and the possible influence of other chemicals on the fireman himself, to prevent his being knocked out or even killed by breathing dangerous fumes.

Preventing fires is of vital importance to the fireman. But this prevention must go further than a mere preachment against carelessness. It must involve an intimate knowledge of some of the scientific facts of fire—the relationship of heat, oxygen and combustible material. To this must be added other semitechnical facts as to gases given off, heat produced, volatility, solubility in water and other characteristics of materials found in commerce.

Special schools of instruction have been set up in practically every State in the Union, consisting of short courses provided by a State college or university.[1]

These requirements are universal and apply to firefighters whether they are employed by municipalities, States, or the Federal Government.

The municipalities have long recognized the responsibilities and the professional nature of the fireman's occupation. This is made obvious by the fact that the firefighter's occupation has been rated high on municipal job evaluation schemes. By this, I mean ranked with professional and skilled people.

On the other hand, the Federal firefighters have not fared well. They have been placed near the bottom rung of the ladder. They are in the same classification with occupations that require less advanced education, training, and acquired skills.

We are not saying that the salaries of these other occupations are not justified; in fact, we recognize the fact that they also lag behind their counterparts in private industry. We are only attempting to emphasize the fact that, while municipalities have recognized the requirements and demands of the firefighting profession, the Federal Government has not.

In conclusion, we are asking that this body take a step in the direction of correcting these existing inequities as provided for in the comparability principle embodied in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962.

A major step can be taken in this direction by the passage of House bill No. 8986.

[1] Quoted information obtained from NBFU bulletins Nos. 234 and 236.

An American Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mrs. Marie Cousland Carpenter, has forwarded to me a prayer which she composed and which I think is lovely. I would like to place it in the RECORD for the edification of those who read it:

AN AMERICAN PRAYER

O Almighty and eternal God,
Thou source of law and life,
We invoke Thy holy guidance
In these times of stress and strife.

Let the leaders of our Nation
Never yield, but press their plan
To elevate in this great wide world
The place of every man.

Let each member of our Nation
Forget this not—But bear in mind
That in the heart of each true American,
Rests the future of mankind.

Grant, that true to our Constitution
We shun the unworthy and seek the good,
And place above all things else
The virtues of true brotherhood.

Let us never be content to live for self,
But with dignity, honor and speed
Develop each God-given talent
In Thy honor—for mankind's need.

Implant the principles of courage and justice
Deep in each American mind;
In our hearts instill love for our fellowman,
In whom Your divine likeness we find.

Let us never be slaves to the narrow mind;
May prejudice ever from us depart,
Mindful that race, religion and political creed
Must never ill feelings start.

Help us to think, to speak and act clearly.
Keep us from every and all transgressions.
May our thoughts, our words and all our deeds
Advance, not retard, all mankind's needs.
Amen.

Patman and Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House will be interested in reading the following objective article from the financial section of the New York Times of March 9, 1964:

PATMAN AND RESERVE—POLICIES OF FEDERAL SYSTEM SURVIVING WAR OF WORDS LED BY CONGRESSMAN

(By M. J. Rossant)

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN'S all-out war against the Federal Reserve System has been loud, furious, and totally ineffective. Mr. PATMAN, who appears to have been conducting a vendetta against the Federal Reserve for many years, sought to make the money managers more responsive to the administration's economic policymakers. But he made more friends for the Reserve than for his own cause.

This was largely due to the Texas Democrat's overzealousness. Instead of concentrating on the Reserve's relationship to the administration, he persisted in flailing away at all sorts of targets, real and imaginary.

Mr. PATMAN lambasted the Reserve for its present monetary policy. He could not resist attacking the Reserve for spending money on entertaining foreign bankers. He created other diversions by seeking information on the personal finances of Federal Reserve bank presidents and by demanding Government audits of the Reserve's books.

CRUCIAL ISSUE

These excursions detracted attention from the crucial issue of whether monetary policy should be subject to political control. The Reserve's present policy or the private lives of its officials have no bearing on this question.

As the regulator of the Nation's money supply, the Reserve can exert a powerful influence over economic conditions. For this reason, Mr. PATMAN feels that it should not be allowed to operate independently. Rather, he argues that monetary policy must be coordinated with the other economic weapons in the hands of the administration.

The notion that central banking is too important to be left entirely to central bankers has many adherents. They feel that the administration, which is responsible for overall economic policy and can be tossed out of office by the voters, must have control over monetary policy. But few of them were willing to aline themselves with Mr. PATMAN in his personal war with the Federal Reserve.

Under the circumstances, the Reserve has had no trouble defending itself. Its officials recognize that failure to cooperate with the administration would invite a serious attack on their independence, so they have been careful to maintain good relations.

Although the Kennedy administration had previously supported some of the proposals for reforming the Reserve recommended by the Commission on Money and Credit, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon gave his blessing to the present state of affairs. In testifying last week before Mr. PATMAN'S committee, he rejected proposals for reform and claimed that he could not conceive of "any closer relationships than those that have characterized the Treasury and the Federal Reserve during the last 3 years."

But many economists would prefer to spell out the division of responsibility and cement the relationship.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Eli Shapiro, professor of finance at Harvard University's Graduate School of Business Administration, who served as codirector of research for the Commission on Money and Credit, argues that "the present structure of our Federal Reserve System contains many vestigial remains which positively do it no good and, in point of fact, lead to suspicion as to its ultimate motivations."

According to Professor Shapiro, it "is desirable that the central bank's activities should be harmonized with the other stabilization activities of the Government." He would not go as far as Mr. PATMAN in bringing the Reserve under the control of the administration, but he does suggest that the President be given the right to name his own chairman and endorses other reform measures proposed by the commission.

Prof. Paul Samuelson, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, also urged that the Reserve be made a more "responsible institution in the American political structure." He observed that "it has been more of a lucky accident than an inherent feature of present legislation and practice that the United States has been able to avoid costly friction; but not even with our lucky combination of personalities and events, has our economy been spared some cost attributable to lack of unified monetary policy."

In proposals for carrying out reform, Professor Samuelson goes along with some suggestions made by the Commission. The objective, he says, should be to make the Reserve something like Britain's House of Lords, which "should be able to delay innovations, to smooth down the volative changes of public opinion and thin majorities."

Professor Shapiro supported the proposal made by James L. Robertson, a Federal Reserve Board governor, to establish a separate banking commission that would have responsibility for banking examinations and supervision. This would leave the money managers free to conduct their primary task of managing money.

But these criticisms of the present relationship failed to get the hearing they deserved. Mr. PATMAN'S indiscriminate attack, his belaboring the Reserve for its practices and performance, succeeded only in obscuring the major issue of reform. The battle over who is to control the Federal Reserve is still to be fought.

Gov. David L. Lawrence—Mr. Democrat of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 1964

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 7, 1964, at the ADA Roosevelt Dinner in Pittsburgh, Mr. Democrat of Pennsylvania, former Gov. David L. Lawrence, spoke eloquently of President and Mrs. Roosevelt and drew an interesting parallel between the first hundred days of Franklin Roosevelt's Presidency and the first 100 days of Lyndon Johnson's Presidency.

The remarks of the Governor follow:

REMARKS OF FORMER GOV. DAVID L. LAWRENCE, ADA ROOSEVELT DAY DINNER, PENN-SHERATON HOTEL, PITTSBURGH, SATURDAY, MARCH 7, 1964

I have always looked forward to these Roosevelt Day dinners with pride and eagerness, because they honor the memory and works of one of history's greatest men and also because they give me the opportunity to once again see so many old friends and coworkers in the liberal cause, some of whom were with me in the vanguard of the Roosevelt movement more than three decades ago. I am proud that the Americans for Democratic Action here in Pittsburgh has maintained the tradition of honoring Franklin Roosevelt every year, just as the Allegheny County Democratic Committee has continued celebrating his birthday each January 30. These affairs demonstrate that we remember the man and what he stood for—as well we should—and that we recognize the continuing need to carry on the work of achieving the kind of world for which he devoted his life.

It would be appropriate, in the years ahead, if these observances honor as well the memory and deeds of Eleanor Roosevelt, whose assistance to her husband and whose activities of her own, have made our lives and millions of others richer and wiser and better. As President Johnson observed about Mrs. Roosevelt this past Wednesday, "poverty was her concern, peace was her hope, people were her passion, just as they were the concern and the hope and the passion of her husband."

We meet tonight 31 years after Franklin Roosevelt's first hundred days had begun, and a week after Lyndon Johnson's first hundred days have been completed. The parallels in the approach and the motivations of these two men are noteworthy and impressive.

Both assumed the Presidency in times of crisis and both acted with a decision and a sureness which gave confidence to the uncertain and optimism to the sick at heart. In his first 3 months in office, Franklin Roosevelt rescued a nation and Lyndon Johnson had the task, in the words of the New Republic, "To unify and reassure the Nation and our allies, establish a feeling of continuity, help assuage our grief, and get things going again."

For Roosevelt, the task required innovation and experimentation, bold new ideas and a determination to move swiftly. His challenges were most domestic, yet in those first hundred days he met with dozens of foreign leaders whose own countries were tottering and on the brink of collapse. Hitler used the chaos in Germany to seize control, and communism threatened many of the staid capitals of Europe—indeed it threatened an America with millions unemployed, with tens of thousands foreclosed from their homes, and with bankrupt corporation and money-poor banking institutions. But Franklin Roosevelt convinced this country, in these first days of his Presidency, that it could survive and prevail, and so it did. Had it not been for him, and for such great leaders of labor like Phil Murray, John Lewis, Sydney Hillman, and Dave Dubinsky, the Red tide might very well had swept over this Nation and freedom, as we know it, destroyed for all time.

While the Roosevelt era extended long after those first terrible and challenging days, it was then that his leadership was indelibly established in America and throughout the world.

In the case of Lyndon Johnson, he had the Presidency thrust upon him with a jolting, unbelievable abruptness in a time of domestic social upheaval and in a world capable of self-obliteration. Pressures for broader economic and social justice at home were powerful and persuasive, while worldwide competitions for power and influence had created dangerous problems in many of the continents of the globe. The numbing shock of President Kennedy's assassination brought confusion and consternation to much of humanity, and fear and uncertainty was abroad in a world of grief.

In his first hundred days, President Johnson made it clear that America's ideals and its purposes remain firm and inviolate, that the struggle for peace with freedom is going forward without pause or falter, and that the dedication to economic progress and social justice is undiminished and undiluted. Indeed, he has never ceased to remind us of his determination to continue the Kennedy program, and the record of his first 3 months is unmistakable evidence that he is holding to this determination and giving it solid achievement.

He has proved that he is a man who gets things done. He is a persistent, resolute, strongminded man, rooted in the populist tradition, skilled in the craft of government, inspired by the greatness of Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, and certain of America's capacity for progress and leadership.

In his hundred days, he has proved his mettle, and made clear that he moves along the liberal pathway, ignoring the roadblocks and shunning the detours.

It is natural, I suppose, that he should remind us of Roosevelt, whom he served so ably, and that his program should identify itself with Kennedy, because he helped conceive that program and was always committed to it. But he has an identity of his own, a reputation for accomplishment, an irresistible persuasiveness, not to mention a tremendous appetite for long hours of hard work. He also has the ability and the wisdom, indispensable in government, of enlisting able men to his cause. There is no better example of this than our speaker this evening, whose counsel and energies have been on constant call and who has helped make the Johnson hundred days the proud and productive ones they have been.

All of which speaks well for this Nation, and its future.

It is a testament to our greatness as a people, when a former teacher from the Texas flatlands carries on the work largely started by a country squire from the banks of the Hudson—work that was moved forward by a farmboy from Missouri and invigorated and enlarged upon by the brilliant grandson of Irish immigrants.

There is every reason for us to believe tonight that Franklin Roosevelt would be proud of this Nation, pleased with its progress, happy about its growing maturity, confident of its leadership.

When that is so, we can all take satisfaction that the work he began so well—although still unfinished—is going on and this Nation and all the world is the better for it.

And that, in truth, is the most fitting memorial we can possibly provide and the only one Franklin Roosevelt would ever have wanted.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers and duties; delegation by; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers and duties; delegation by.".

Changes in position titles

SEC. 307. Whenever reference is made in any law or reorganization plan to the—

Administrative Assistant Attorney General,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Labor,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, or

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,

such reference shall be held and considered to mean the—

Assistant Attorney General for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Administraiton,

Assistant Secretary of Labor for Administration.

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Administration, or

Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Administration,

respectively.

Limitation on salaries fixed by administrative action

SEC. 308. Except as provided by this Act and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the head of any executive department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch who is authorized to fix by administrative action the annual rate of basic compensation for any position, officer, or employee shall not fix such rate in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to impair the authorities provided in the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended (50 U.S.C. 403a and following).

Positions placed under Classification Act of 1949

SEC. 309. Each office or position in the executive branch specifically referred to in, or covered by, any conforming change in law made by section 305 of this Act which is not placed in a level of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule pursuant to section 303 of this Act, shall be placed in the appropriate grade of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in accordance with the provisions of such Act.

Saving provisions

SEC. 310. (a) Except as provided by this Act, the changes in existing law made by this Act shall not affect any office or posithe existing immediately prior to the effective date of any such changes in existing law, the compensation attached to such office or position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his entitlement to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken in accordance with this Act or other law.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the rate of basic compensation received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of this Act shall not be reduced by reason of enactment of this Act.

Mr. MURRAY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the title be dispensed with, that it be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OLSEN OF MONTANA

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Page 41, line 13, strike out "1963" and insert in lieu thereof "1964"; And on page 43, immediately following line 3, insert the following:

"Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"Director of Central Intelligence.

"Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

And on page 44, immediately following "(18)" in line 7, insert the word "Deputy";

And on page 45, strike out lines 9 and 10 and redesignate accordingly the subparagraphs following line 10 on page 45.

And on page 45, immediately following "(38)" in line 14, insert the word "Deputy";

And on page 45, immediately following line 23, insert the following:

"Comptroller of the Currency.

"Commissioner of Internal Revenue."

And on page 58, line 8, stirke out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)";

And on page 68, line 23, strike out "203 of this Act" and insert in lieu thereof "303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964".

And on page 71, immediately before the period in line 24, insert ", in section 3 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831b), or in section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 481, relating to the Comptroller of the Currency)".

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, these are technical corrections to the bill, for the most part. In the several printed copies made of the bill there were some errors in the placing of the executive positions in the wrong level. For instance, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Director of Central Intelligence were included in level 2 of the administration approved bill with which we started. The committee bill now before us inadvertently placed them in level 3. The committee did not intend to reduce the ranking of these three positions. Under existing law, these positions are in the same level as most of the positions included in level 2 under H.R. 8986.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. These positions were inadvertently put in these grades and should have been put in the grades the amendment calls for. The committee members on this side will accept the amendment.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States can be rightfully proud of the system of internal revenue taxation that has carefully and deliberately evolved throughout the years. We, in the legislative branch, must share the successful role we have played in this evolution with the able and dedicated men who have accepted the burdens of the office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue. I know of few positions, within or outside Government, which are as complex, as difficult, or as responsible.

One of the most important responsibilities the Commissioner has is to foster and encourage a general attitude of taxpayer compliance with our tax laws and regulations. We have watched in our time the growth of a spirit of voluntary taxpayer compliance unmatched elsewhere in a free society. More than 97 percent of our tax revenues are the results of self-assessments by the taxpayers. From the standpoint of relative efficiency, no tax jurisdiction that I know of can match the continuing record of the Internal Revenue Service. Consistently, they have kept the costs of collecting our revenues down to much less than ½ cent per tax dollar. Without the spirit of fiscal integrity which we rely upon the Commissioner to foster and instill in our citizens, I cannot imagine the levels to which our costs of collection might grow.

I am moved to compare the efficiency and results achieved in this country to the tax collection efforts in other lands. We can be grateful for the caliber of men who have willingly accepted the responsibility to administer the tax laws we now live under.

It is my point in these remarks to offer a reminder that H.R. 8986 furnishes little recognition, indeed, for the job we have come to expect from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Under this bill, level IV is the highest level in the proposed Federal executive salary schedule that the President can assign to this job. This is a clear demotion of the Commissioner's position. I ask that the position be regarded as no less than level III in the legislation we finally enact.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OLSEN OF MONTANA

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Page 69, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(j)(1) Sections 2 and 3 of the Act of July 25, 1959 (72 Stat. 414; D.C. Code, secs. 1–204a and 1–204b), relating to the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, are amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided by this section and section 3 of this Act—

"'(1) the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $29,000 each per annum; and

"'(2) the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall receive an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section.

"'SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"'(1) the compensation of the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $29,500 per annum; and

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"(2) If the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army is chosen President of the Board of Commissioners, he shall receive, as President of the Board, an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section.'

"(2) Section 11-702(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 484; Public Law 88-241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, is amended—

"(A) by striking out '$19,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$28,000'; and

"(B) by striking out $18,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$27,500'.

(3) Section 11-902(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 487; Public Law 88-241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, is amended—

"(A) by striking out '$18,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$26,500'; and

"(B) by striking out '$17,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$26,000'.

"(4) The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2402), relating to the compensation of the person appointed to the District of Columbia Tax Court, is amended by striking out '$17,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$26,000'.

"(5) That part of the salary schedule in section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (76 Stat. 1229; D.C. Code, sec. 31-1501), relating to the compensation of the Superintendent of Schools, and Deputy Superintendent of Schools, of the District of Columbia, which reads:

"'Class 1: Superintendent of Schools $19,000
Class 2: Deputy superintendent.. 16,500'

is amended to read as follows:

"'Class 1: Superintendent of Schools $28,000
Class 2: Deputy superintendent.. 22,500'

"(6) That part of the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 480), as amended (Sec. 4-823, et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 edition) relating to the compensation of the Fire Chief and Chief of Police, which reads:

"'Class 10 ..... Fire Chief. Chief of Police."	$17,000	$17,400	$17,800	$18,200	.....	$18,600	$19,000'

is amended to read as follows:

"'Class 10 ..... Fire Chief. Chief of Police."	$21,000	$21,500	$22,000	$22,500	.....	$23,000	$23,500'

Mr. OLSEN of Montana (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to a most regrettable oversight in H.R. 8986. I refer to the omission from either level II or level III in section 303, of the position of Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Under the bill in its present form, the highest salary that the President could assign this position is level IV. Considering the positions listed in level II— and especially those shown in level III—this is not only a substantial demotion for this position, but a gross underestimate of the importance of the tax agency alongside the positions which the bill approves for higher levels.

Under the Executive Pay Act of 1956, in section 104(a), the position of Commissioner of Internal Revenue was shown at No. 1 in a salary range providing for a total of 20 positions. Eighteen of these positions—now paid on the same basis as the Commissioner—are assigned either to level II or level III of the proposed Federal Executive Salary Schedule. It was the judgment of Congress in 1956 that the position of Commissioner of Internal Revenue should be numbered among the most important and most difficult in the Federal Establishment. In my present judgment, the Commissioner's position should be maintained in this same leading category. I am strengthened in my conviction by the fact that at level III in the bill presently before us there can be identified 17 positions which hitherto have been paid at lower rates than the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Surely, it was never intended that these jobs were to be considered of superior scope and importance than the IRS position. But that is precisely what will come about unless the Commissioner's position is rightly restored to the relationship it had with the other positions under the 1956 Executive Pay Act.

Relative size and importance of agencies should have been given some consideration in the assignment of an appropriate salary level for the IRS position. In this connection, I note that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue heads an organization fully 2½ times as large as the largest of the agency head positions listed in level II. Moreover, level II includes both autonomous and semiautonomous agencies, the latter represented by the Administrator, Agency for International Development, a constituent bureau of the State Department. By the same reasoning that places this position in level II, it is my firm belief that the IRS position is no less than a level III job. This semiautonomous status of the Internal Revenue Service within the Treasury Department has been recognized in an interesting fashion by a White House document. In 1955, Foreign Operations Administration—one of the predecessors of the Agency for International Development—was changed by Executive Order No. 10610 from an independent agency to a part of the State Department. President Eisenhower at that time explained that the foreign aid agency would function within the Department of State in the same manner as Internal Revenue within the Treasury Department; that is, with internal autonomy for its operations, but subject to policy control and coordination by the Department.

The Administrator of the Agency for International Development like the Commissioner of Internal Revenue within Treasury Department, still operates with "superbureau" status. Since the H.R. 8986 recognizes level II for the AID job, I ask that no less than level III recognition be extended to the position of Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

PROPOSED PAY STATUS OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

This paper discusses the downward revision in the relative executive pay level of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as proposed in H.R. 8986.

First. The attached memorandum sets forth the effect of the bill on the relative ranking of the Commissioner within the executive branch.

Second. The relation of the Commissioner within the Treasury.

The positions of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue are relatively constant combinations of the duties and responsibilities, largely determined by statutory guidelines. On the other hand, the duties of the Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury are determined from time to time at the discretion of the particular Secretary at the time. Delegations of authority flow from the Secretary to the Commissioner, and not from the Under Secretary. At various times the Commissioner has reported direct to the Secretary, or through an Assistant and, currently, through the Under Secretary. In job evaluation terms, the Commissioner's supervisor is the Secretary with the Under Secretary as his assistant for this purpose, among others, considered as a single supervisory combination. This is at a high level, an instance of a position of Assistant Chief—here, the Under Secretary—not necessarily a grade higher than a principal subordinate of their Chief, even though the subordinate reports through the Assistant Chief.

Again in job evaluation terms, a comparison of the positions of the Commissioner and the Under Secretary confirms that they are substantially equivalent, all factors being considered, even though one is higher in hierarchical rank. The public identification and management responsibility of the Commisisoner of Internal Revenue for the operations of the Service, involve the tremendous magni-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
March 17, 1964.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I John 5: 4: *This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.*

Eternal God, our Father, we humbly acknowledge that our own day is a time which is trying the souls of men and filling many with fear and foreboding.

It fortifies us to know that all along the dark and dismal paths of history there walked those who have remained steadfast and strong, however beset by trials and tribulations.

Help us also to carry on bravely for we believe that in our day and generation we have companions and comrades who are ready to suffer and sacrifice for that which is true and honorable and will never surrender to fear and cowardice.

Grant that in the great adventure and gigantic struggle of establishing peace on earth and brotherhood among men, may we cling with increasing tenacity of faith to the sustaining and indwelling spirit of our blessed Lord.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the President pro tempore had appointed Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. PEARSON, as members on the part of the Senate, to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in Geneva, Switzerland, from March 23 to June 15, 1964.

NEED FOR RECONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF LEGISLATION TO INCREASE PAY LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 248)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States; which was read, and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 17, 1964.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I urge the House to reconsider and approve legislation to increase pay levels of Government employees. If the pay raise is not enacted, it will deprive 2 million Federal workers of fair and reasonable pay adjustments; make it difficult to recruit and retain top-flight men and women; impair my efforts to achieve true economy in Government.

Specifically, failure to take this action will—

undercut the principle and the promise of comparable pay—Federal career pay scales comparable to those in private enterprise—adopted by the Congress just a year and a half ago in the historic Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962;

thwart our efforts to strengthen professional and technical leadership and step up the productivity of Federal workers. Competence is the keystone of that program. Fair salaries are vital to attract and hold competent people;

make it harder than ever to recruit and hold the outstanding people we need for our top policy jobs. They already earn less—often far less—than they did earn, or could earn, in private jobs. This salary gap has been growing. The proposed bill will not close it. But it will reverse a dangerous trend;

jeopardize increases in military pay which I have recommended to keep Armed Forces pay generally in line with nonmilitary salaries;

renew pressures for the old approach of flat percentage increases for postal and other career workers. Such increases destroy a fair and rational pay system.

Every cent of these increases is already included in my budget for fiscal year 1965—the smallest budget in proportion to our national output since 1951.

Congress and the country surely support my determined drive for economy in Government. To make that policy work, I need first-class managers who can tighten organizations, simplify procedures, trim waste, and inspire maximum effort. It is false economy to offer salaries that will attract the mediocre but repel the talented. Business, foundations, universities, State and local governments are all learning that lesson—or already have.

If Congressmen feel they should postpone increasing their salaries until next year, even though they are most deserving of an increase in pay, there is no reason to postpone equitable and just action for others who serve the Government and the Nation.

I need your help in my program to get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar's worth of pay—and the dollars paid to attract brains and ability to the Federal service will come back to the American people many times over in more economical and effective Government.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the Honorable CARL HAYDN, President pro tempore of the Senate.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

(Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to thank the Ancient Order of Hibernians for presenting the carnations that we wear today to the Congress.

I also thank those who have flown from Ireland the shamrocks that we see here today. The Members of Congress and the people connected with the running of the Congress are thankful to the Ancient Order of Hibernians for their generosity, and to the Ambassador.

THE LATE SENATOR JAMES M. MEAD

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and distressed to learn of the passing of former Senator James M. Mead. Senator, as he was known even after his retirement, was loved by every person who knew him, and I feel personally gifted that I was privileged to know him.

Mr. Speaker, words are inadequate to convey the popularity of Senator Mead. His passing will be sorrowed by many, not only in the Buffalo, N.Y., area, but all over the Nation. He was a giant among other political leaders, and was devoted to his fellow man throughout his public and private life. Senator Mead worked untiringly for the benefit of the workingman, and particularly for postal and classified workers.

Mr. Speaker, a most eloquent summary of the wonderful life of Senator James J. Mead has been compiled by one of our leading newspapers, the Buffalo Evening News.

James Michael Mead, 78, who rose from a railroad worker's shack to a leading place in national politics, died today after a long illness.

Starting in the Erie County Board of Supervisors, he served as a legislator at the local, State, and national levels for 32 successive years.

During the New Deal era of Democratic dominance he was one of his party's most influential leaders in Congress.

He withdrew from active politics in 1947

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

key. I know that you do not believe in segregation. I know that it is your private property. But the State law says, 'Segregate.' "

Is that not an interference with private property? I say that it is. The businessman might say, "Segregation would ruin me economically. It runs against my religion. It is opposed to my attitude. It is against my sense of morality."

Still, the sheriff says, "Sorry, old boy. The law says 'Segregate.' "

Why do not people who are in opposition to the bill condemn that practice? The Government of the United States says, "You shall be treated as a citizen of the United States." We do not say "integrate." In the bill it is provided that segregation in public places and in public establishments violates the Constitution, and particularly so if a State law requires it.

The Constitution further guarantees equal privileges and immunities and equal treatment under the law for every citizen of the United States. If that is not the case, then a citizen, regardless of his looks—whether he is short or tall, thin or fat, flatfooted or high arched, bald or curly headed—is entitled to come into public places. That is the simple argument.

I thank the Senator for his tolerance and understanding.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the Senate recessed, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 18, 1964, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 17 (legislative day of March 9), 1964:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mary Dublin Keyserling, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, vice Mrs Esther Peterson, elevated.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 110 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1964 No. 48

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rabbi Arthur Schneier, M.A., of Congregation Zichron Ephraim, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Founding Fathers, touched by Thine infinite wisdom, forged a union of self-governing states. The self-rule of individual communities molded into national unity, strengthened the American character of initiative and resourcefulness. It made us freemen instead of slaves of the state. This independent spirit, in 300 years, developed small New Amsterdam into the thriving metropolis of New York.

O Lord, help us resist pressure and temptation to alter the delicate balance of Government power. May these sacred halls not become pressure chambers of selfishness. Help us rather execute what is right in Thy sight.

Knowing that our cities and States can become outposts of national honor or disgrace, O God, help us cast aside provincial pride which keeps our hearts from one another. May we unite in the fight against poverty and human misery so that everyone in our land can gratefully proclaim, "We have eaten, we are satisfied, blessed be Thy name, O Lord." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 12, 1964, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 10, 1964:

H.R. 5982. An act for the relief of Pasquale Fiorica;

H.R. 7235. An act to amend sections 671 and 672 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the Clerk and the Marshal of the Supreme Court; and

H.R. 8171. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands, including farm units and improvements thereon, in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, and to continue to deliver water for 3 years to lands of said division, and for other purposes.

On March 11, 1964:

H.R. 6092. An act for the relief of Alexander Haytko;

H.R. 7821. An act for the relief of Wladyslawa Pytlak Jarosz; and

H.R. 9640. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

On March 13, 1964:

H.R. 1182. An act for the relief of Willy Sapuschnin;

H.R. 1295. An act for the relief of Edith and Joseph Sharon;

H.R. 1355. An act for the relief of Stanislawa Ouelette;

H.R. 1364. An act for the relief of Areti Siozos Paidas;

H.R. 1455. An act for the relief of Ewald Johan Consen;

H.R. 1520. An act for the relief of Jozefa Trzcinska Biskup and Ivanka Stalcer Vlahovic;

H.R. 1521. An act for the relief of Lovorko Lucic;

H.R. 1723. An act for the relief of Agnese Brienza;

H.R. 1886. An act for the relief of Valeriano T. Ebreo;

H.R. 4085. An act for the relief of Tibor Horcsik;

H.R. 4284. An act for the relief of Chrysanthos Kyriakou;

H.R. 4682. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred T. Winfield;

H.R. 5144. An act for the relief of Doyle A. Ballou;

H.R. 5617. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Renee Louise Gabrielle Huffer;

H.R. 6313. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Kuryj;

H.R. 6320. An act for the relief of Walter L. Mathews and others;

H.R. 6477. An act for the relief of Capt. Otis R. Bowles;

H.R. 6591. An act for the relief of Constantine Theothoropoulos;

H.R. 7347. An act for the relief of Teresa Elliopoulos and Anastasia Elliopoulos;

H.R. 7533. An act for the relief of Demetrios Dousopoulos;

H.R. 8085. An act for the relief of Roy W. Ficken;

H.R. 8322. An act for the relief of John George Kostantoyannis; and

H.R. 8507. An act for the relief of certain medical and dental officers of the Air Force.

FEDERAL PAY RAISE BILL

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, a great number of us found ourselves in a most difficult position last Thursday when we considered the pay raise bill. Most of us recognized a need for a general pay increase among Federal employees.

Exclude from this bill those unreasonably high increases in the legislative, executive, and judicial salaries and I become an enthusiastic supporter of this legislation. It is needed and desirable. That which made it most difficult was the fact that included were substantial increases in the legislative, executive, and judicial which would have, of course, included a substantial increase in my own salary. My expenses are great and I feel the pinch of the cost-of-living rise but I could not and would not vote for a $10,000 increase for myself. If I had voted for this substantial increase, how could I have looked a laboring man back in Indiana in the eye when I know he is making less than $5,000 or $6,000 per year. I could not.

If these increases in the top-pay brackets could be reduced so as to provide for a modest increase, then I would have supported this bill. But, as it stood, I had to vote against it. Because of the support I want to give to the Federal employee, I hope that this matter might be reconsidered and we might have another chance to vote on a reasonable pay raise bill.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Select Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit during general debate on March 17 and 18 next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON POVERTY

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day for the Congress. Today we have received a message from the President which commits this Nation to a total, unrelenting, and—I am sure—a successful war against poverty.

We enjoy in this country today unprecedented prosperity and affluence, but fully a fifth of our people do not share it. This is an intolerable situation. The President has spoken for all of us in his determination that the benefits of our advanced technology and, perhaps even more importantly, the American conscience will be directed now to bringing basic security and comfort to the more than 30 million Americans who do not have such security and comfort.

There is no single cause or aspect of poverty. It must, therefore, be fought on many fronts and with many weapons. The President's recommendations constitute a well-rounded, coordinated series of specific programs. Emphasis will be on youth, because we seek not only to relieve today's poverty but to prevent tomorrow's.

I hail the President's message, because it puts its emphasis on what all Americans can do in this great crusade—not just the Federal Government. Every community in America will now be challenged to take part.

The Congress will now work its will on the specific recommendations of the President. I am confident that his message sets us on the right course. The American people will join President Johnson in hoping for quick and comprehensive action by the Congress. This is now our round. Let the people who will benefit from this program know that we will not let them down.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON POVERTY

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the President's program for combating poverty in America is one of the most sweeping ever presented to the Congress. Its practical approach recognizes that poverty must be attacked from many different directions—that there is no single panacea for reducing the extent and severity of poverty.

I like the emphasis which the program places on local initiative and planning. It is proper that each community should take the lead, with Federal financial assistance, in determining how to reduce poverty in its own area.

Two of the programs recommended—the National Job Corps and the work-study program—bring back memories of two of the finest programs ever undertaken by this Nation—the CCC—Civilian Conservation Corps—and the NYA—National Youth Administration. Back in the 1930's the CCC and the NYA won almost universal acclaim for what they did for the youth of that generation, and it is my fervent hope that these new programs will furnish the same great help for the poverty-stricken youth of this generation.

The selection of Sargent Shriver to coordinate and supervise this program is a magnificent choice. His direction of the Peace Corps has won unprecedented international acclaim, and his reputation as a diplomatic, farseeing, dollar-conscious administrator of great skill will get President Johnson's antipoverty program off to a fine start.

THE DAY OF DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

(Mr. CAREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, we have the message and the target is poverty. No citizen can deny its effect, no legislator can be indifferent to its existence in a land of abundance blessed by providence.

The message is as important as the message. The proposals are truly in accord with the principle and virtue of distributive justice.

They respect the freedom of the individual and the unity of the family.

They enlist all our effort and resources—public and private—without discrimination as to persons or projects. This distributive justice program addresses itself to our national dilemma.

Under our national creed we are created equal but through the predicament of poverty we have been too long unequal.

Now we purpose to proportion our national effort—public, private, and individual—to create opportunity for the full development of the potential of every American.

In education, in the economy, in rural slough and urban slum, this is a day of hope—the dawn of distributive justice.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, on rollcall No. 62, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE BAKER INVESTIGATION

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is time for a single standard for witnesses appearing before congressional committees. It is time to end the double standard treatment that has resulted in the coddling of White House Aid Walter Jenkins. What has been in the mind of the committee that refuses to call him, and continues to insulate him against any possible perjury prosecution?

Mr. Don Reynolds was questioned under oath. He has said he will return for still more questioning as to the contradiction between his testimony and the statement attributed to Jenkins.

The committee counsel has tried to rationalize the double standard. He refuses to put Jenkins under oath and question him on the arrangements under which $1,200 was paid to the L.B.J. Co. Jenkins was an employee of the other body at the time of the transaction. The fact that he has become a White House employee should give him no immunity now.

Had there been no confrontation between Whittaker Chambers and Alger Hiss there would have been only inconclusive denials and coverups.

It is the duty of Congress to find the truth, and to diligently search out the facts when there are contradictions. If Congress fails, then there can be no respect for the authority of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, part 1 of the hearing record of the Senate Rules Committee contains a memorandum prepared by two committee staff members from which I quote the following:

> Mr. Jenkins has no knowledge of any conversation between Mr. Baines and Mr. Reynolds, nor does he have any knowledge of any arrangements by which Reynolds purchased advertising time on the TV station.

In the same hearing record—part 1—the counsel for the committee, Mr. McClendon, questioned Mr. Reynolds, as follows:

> Mr. MCCLENDON. What comment, if any, do you have to make about the content of the statements made by Mr. Jenkins in the interview?
>
> Mr. REYNOLDS. No. 1 is the statement that he had no knowledge of any question of advertising time to be purchased from KTBC, which is a station owned by L.B.J. Co., sir.
>
> Mr. MCCLENDON. And your statement is—
>
> Mr. REYNOLDS. He did have knowledge and discussed it with me, sir. And he discussed it directly with the president of the Mid-Atlantic Stainless Steel Co., Mr. Albert G. Young.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Reynolds appeared before the committee and testified under oath. Mr. Jenkins, the Presidential aid, has not been called to do likewise although there is here a clear case of perjury on the part of someone.

The public is entitled to the truth.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 66 I am recorded as not answering. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and the Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

And in the postwar period, the Greek people were again threatened by a tyranny from the East. Soviet Russia attempted to subjugate this freedom-loving people. With timely American aid, the Greek people were again successful in defending their freedom.

Mr. President, our commemorating Greek Independence Day reconfirms our devotion to the principle of democracy which came to light in Greece thousands of years ago and emphasizes our determination to see that its light shall banish the darkness which threatens to envelop our world today.

FEDERAL PAY RAISE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last week President Johnson in a letter to the Speaker urged the other body to reconsider its recent action killing the bill to raise the salaries of 1.7 million Federal employees.

I am immensely gratified that the President's recommendations were followed almost immediately by the introduction of a number of new bills in the House leaving out congressional pay raises, and limited to primarily the classified service, the postal employees, and others in the three branches of Government. I understand the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the other body will begin its consideration of these measures tomorrow. The expedition is most heartening, for if action were delayed out of consideration for the opposition that had developed with regard to the congressional pay hike, an immense injustice would be done to those Federal career employees who have been promised that the principle of comparable pay—pay scales more nearly comparable to those in private enterprise—would be translated into concrete form this year.

I have read reports that the new measures may run into heavy weather with some Members of Congress, since upper echelon salaries in the other branches of the Government and among congressional staff might conceivably be raised enough to be higher than the present pay of Congressmen. In my view, while this possibility is present, and poses a genuine problem, that is all the more reason for plowing into consideration of the bill right now and threshing out these problems, so that past promises to classified and postal workers may be redeemed. I know there is a widespread feeling that the Senate may not be able to reach any pay bill until after the civil rights bill is disposed of; but that view neglects to take into account the fact that considerable progress may be made in the other body and, as I have urged, in the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, while the civil rights bill is pending here, so that we may be in an advantageous position to take final action when the civil rights bill is no longer holding up our other business.

Mr. President, I hope the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the other body and, in turn, the House itself will give prompt approval to one of the pending new measures. I am confident that the Senate, if given an opportunity to do so, would follow suit as soon as feasible, consistent with the parliamentary situation now confronting us.

UNNECESSARY EXPENDITURES IN THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today the Comptroller General submitted another report in which he sharply criticizes the Defense Department for an unnecessary expenditure of more than $445 million.

In this report the Comptroller General calls our attention to an expenditure by the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics—since reorganized as the Bureau of Naval Weapons—of more than $445.4 million over a 10-year period for the P–6M–2 seaplane program, and according to the Comptroller General they did not receive a single serviceable aircraft as the result of these expenditures.

The most of these expenditures represents payments made to the Glenn L. Martin Co., Baltimore, Md., over the past 10 years.

Continuing, the Comptroller General states that the Bureau ordered quantity production of 24 operational P–6M–2 seaplanes before a reasonably satisfactory seaplane had been developed.

This is another typical example of the irresponsible manner in which the procurement division squanders the taxpayers' money in the name of national defense. In this instance nearly $500 million was spent for planes which never left the ground.

This entire report dated March 23, 1964, No. B–146885, should be read by every Member of Congress and in particular by the Appropriations Committee. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1964.

To the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE:

Enclosed is our report on additional costs incurred in the procurement of P6M seaplanes from the Glenn L. Martin Co., Baltimore, Md., by the Department of the Navy. The P–6M program, which was begun in 1951 to fulfill a need for a fast jet-powered seaplane for laying mines, was terminated in August 1959 because of delays, increased costs, and unexpected difficulties experienced with the aircraft.

Our review disclosed that the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics (since reorganized as the Bureau of Naval Weapons) spent spent more than $445.4 million over a 10-year period for the P–6M seaplane program and did not receive a single serviceable aircraft. The Bureau ordered quantity production of 24 operational P–6M–2 seaplane before a reasonably satisfactory seaplane had been developed. The award of this production contract for the 24 operational aircraft and contracts for supporting items at a time when it was known that there were serious unsolved problems with the prototype aircraft resulted in expenditures of $209.2 million which might have been saved if these contracts had not been awarded. Also, our review disclosed that significant cost increases were incurred by the Navy in this program because of design and engineering errors committed by the contractor as well as a failure by the contractor to adhere to the Navy's aircraft testing procedures. Under the terms of the contracts, the cost of the contractor's errors are borne exclusively by the Government.

The Martin Co., by letter dated March 29, 1963, commented on a draft of this report. The Martin comments dealt generally with the difficulties anticipated and experienced in making the technical advances needed to develop an aircraft to meet the Navy requirements for the P–6M. The Martin reply did not comment on the specific findings or deficiencies related in our report.

In commenting on our findings and conclusions, the Navy agreed that serious problems with the P–6M were known and that solutions were not certain when it ordered quantity production, but informed us that, in accordance with its policies and practices at the time, the Navy feels that it was justified in entering into and continuing the production program until terminated in August 1959. The Navy acknowledged, however, that, on the basis of a current assessment, it should have terminated the program at an earlier date. The Navy agreed with our proposal that in the future costly quantity production of new weapon systems should not be authorized until the contractor has given adequate evidence that a satisfactory operational product has been developed. The Navy informed us that its current programing system and new program change and review procedures established by the Office of the Secretary of Defense would assure that the objective of our proposal would be carried out. In view of these changes, we are not making any recommendations at this time relative to premature contracting for production quantities of an unproved item.

The Navy, in commenting on the additional costs incurred by the Government because of the contractor's errors, advised us that the contractor could not be held financially responsible for such additional costs in accordance with the contract terms. The contracts provide that the contractor will not be responsible for the additional costs resulting from correction of defective work unless the defective work resulted from fraud, lack of good faith, or willful misconduct on the part of the contractor.

It is unreasonable for the Government to incur the costs resulting from errors or defective workmanship on the part of a contractor. This seems particularly true when the Government has selected that contractor for its competence in the field. Accordingly, we are of the opinion that provision should be included in development and production contracts which will place financial responsibility on the contractor for additional costs incurred due to engineering errors or design deficiencies resulting from poor performance on the part of the contractor. We recognize that a distinction must be made between additional costs incurred in development contracts when the reasons are associated with technological risks in new areas as opposed to lack of competence on the part of a manufacturer in his specialized field or a failure to apply the developed state of the art involved. Therefore, we are recommending to the Secretary of Defense that the present contract clauses be revised and implemented to require the contractor to assume financial responsibility under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee development and production contracts for additional costs incurred due to performance which is less than should be expected of a skilled contractor. We are recommending also that administrative procedures include realistic criteria upon which the quality of the contractor's performance can be evaluated.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

ALLEGED FORGERIES ON TAX RETURNS IN THE ROBERT BAKER CASE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on March 12 I received an affidavit from Mr. Milton L. Hauft, an accountant who on occasions had prepared income tax returns for Mr. Robert G. Baker.

In the affidavit Mr. Hauft charged specifically that on one of the individual tax returns of Mr. Baker on file in the Treasury Department his signature is a forgery; in addition, he insisted that two of the partnership returns prepared for the Carousel Motel as they appear in the Treasury Department's records likewise bear his forged signatures.

I ask unanimous consent that the affidavit of Mr. Hauft, as transmitted to the committee on March 12, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the affidavit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 12, 1964.

I, Milton L. Hauft, living at 3801 Archer Place, Kensington, Md., do give this affidavit to Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS (Delaware) of my own free will.

On this date I was called to the Internal Revenue Service to give information relative to tax returns I had prepared for Robert G. Baker.

During the course of presenting the information in my possession I was questioned about some partnership tax returns prepared for the Carousel Motel. During the course of my association with Mr. Baker I had never prepared any returns for the Carousel Motel. When presented with the return by the Internal Revenue Service I noted that the signatures purported to be mine were forgeries.

As the result of this I went back to the personal returns for Mr. Baker prepared by me, and on looking at the signatures on these returns I noted that the signatures as to the person preparing these returns were also forgeries and were not my signatures.

This was reported immediately to the investigators of the Internal Revenue Service, and samples and specimens of my handwriting were also presented to them for matching purposes.

MILTON L. HAUFT.

District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 12th day of March, 1964.

KATHRYN M. COULTER,
Notary Public.

My commission expires April 14, 1965.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last Friday a representative of the Treasury Department confirmed that the Department agreed that the signatures of the accountant appearing on the Carousel Motel partnership returns were not the bona fide signatures of the accountant.

The accountant likewise stands by his sworn statement that his name has been forged on these partnership returns and that he had never participated in the preparation of these returns.

In addition, one of Mr. Baker's personal tax returns on file in the Treasury Department bears the forged signature of this same accountant.

These charges have not been contradicted by the Treasury Department, the Justice Department, or anyone else.

The accountant's signatures as appearing on these returns are recognized as forgeries.

Mr. President, the question has been raised as to what the penalties are for filing a tax return which bears a forged signature of the preparer of the return. In order that there may be no question as to the penalty, I directed an inquiry to Mr. Colin F. Stam, chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

I have just received a letter from Mr. Stam from which I shall read in part and then place the whole letter in the RECORD. I quote:

This is in response to your inquiry regarding the penalty provisions applicable in a situation where a tax return has been filed with a forged signature of a preparer of the return.

In the letter Mr. Stam points out various sections of the law under which affixing a forged signature would be a crime and what the penalty would be.

Mr. Stam points out that any person who forges a signature on a tax return "shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both, together with the costs of the prosecution."

Prosecution could also develop under section 7207 of the Internal Revenue Code. An offender could also be prosecuted under section 1001 of the Criminal Code.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of March 25, 1964, signed by Mr. Colin F. Stam, outlining the penalties for forging the signature of a preparer on a tax return be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, March 25, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your inquiry regarding the penalty provisions applicable in a situation where a tax return has been filed with a forged signature of a preparer of the return.

Under the Internal Revenue Code, such an offense may be prosecuted under section 7206(1) or under section 7207. Section 7206 (1) provides:

"Any person who—

"(1) Declaration under penalties of perjury.—Willfully makes and subscribes any return, statement, or other document, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and which he does not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter; or".

* * * * *

"shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both, together with the costs of prosecution."

Section 7207 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to fraudulent returns, statements, or other documents provides:

"Any person who willfully delivers or discloses to the Secretary or his delegate any list, return, account, statement, or other document, known by him to be fraudulent or to be false as to any material matter, shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. Any person required pursuant to section 6047(b) or (c) to furnish any information to the Secretary or any other person who willfully furnishes to the Secretary or such other person any information known by him to be fraudulent or to be false as to any material matter shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Such an offense may also be prosecuted under section 1001 of the Criminal Code of the United States (title 18, U.S. Code), which provides:

"SEC. 1001. Statements or Entries Generally. Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. MANSFIELD that the Senate proceed to consider the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7152.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPROVED MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION IN FOREIGN AID

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the President's decision not to make major organizational changes in our foreign aid program is, I am sure, based partly on

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 110 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 1964 No. 55

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, March 9, 1964)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of life and light, our glad hearts thrill at the risen glory of the awakening earth robed in the blooming garb of spring. As common bushes, lately so bare, are now aflame, and the time for the singing of birds has come, may a spiritual springtime make our own hearts even as the garden of the Lord, where barren branches may be clothed upon with the beauty of holiness and the fair flowers of humility and charity lift their fair petals above the fallow ground.

In this week of weeks, as we are driven to the strange Man lifted up from the earth, as He climbs new Calvaries with the Cross that ne'er turns back, may we know that it is by that sign that we, too, must conquer as we face those who would exploit and degrade the holy temple of human personality.

Whatever the future holds, in the might of that conquering sign, may we face it, calm and confident in the assurance that there lives the beauty that man cannot kill.

May we hold that faith, and hold it fast. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCINTYRE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 23, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1057) to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CELLER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. MCCULLOCH, and Mr. MOORE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 962) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for the Department of Labor, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 962) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for the Department of Labor, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be the usual morning hour, with statements not to exceed 3 minutes in length.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 96 Leg.]

Aiken	Hartke	Morton
Allott	Hayden	Mundt
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bayh	Hill	Nelson
Beall	Holland	Neuberger
Bennett	Hruska	Pastore
Bible	Humphrey	Pell
Boggs	Inouye	Prouty
Brewster	Jackson	Proxmire
Burdick	Javits	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Johnston	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Carlson	Keating	Scott
Case	Kennedy	Smathers
Clark	Lausche	Smith
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Cotton	Long, La.	Stennis
Curtis	Magnuson	Symington
Dirksen	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dodd	McCarthy	Thurmond
Dominick	McClellan	Walters
Douglas	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McGovern	Williams, Del.
Fong	McIntyre	Yarborough
Fulbright	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Goldwater	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Monroney	
Hart	Morse	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is absent because of illness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is absent on official business.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF AN ASTRONAUT PHYSICAL CONDITIONING FACILITY

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of an astronaut physical conditioning facility, as an extension of the Translation and Docking Simulation Facility at the Manned Spacecraft Center, Clear Lake, Tex.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY PER DIEM PAYMENTS FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL REPORTING EARLY FOR TEMPORARY DUTY ASSIGNMENTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary per diem payments for military personnel reporting early for temporary duty assignments, Department of the Navy, dated March 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DEFICIENCIES AND PROBLEM AREAS RELATING TO ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN STATE OF NEW YORK

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on deficiencies and problem areas relating to the administration of the Federal-aid highway program in the State of New York, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated March 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ADDITIONAL COSTS INCURRED IN PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN SEAPLANES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional costs incurred in the procurement of P-6M seaplanes from Glenn L. Martin Co., Baltimore, Md., Department of the Navy, dated March 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 2275 AND 2276 OF THE REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO CERTAIN LANDS GRANTED TO THE STATES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to certain lands granted to the States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition signed by Marvin J. Andersen, for the Jack Fork Creek Watershed Ranchers, of Sardis, Okla., praying for a congressional hearing with reference to the Clayton Dam on Jack Fork Creek in Pushwataha County, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A petition signed by Marvin J. Andersen, and sundry other citizens of the State of Oklahoma, praying for a congressional hearing and reconsideration of the Clayton Dam approved for construction on Jack Fork Creek in Pushwataha County, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A memorial signed by Stanley H. Smith, Jr., and sundry other citizens of the State of Arizona, remonstrating against the enactment of the civil rights bill; ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2679. A bill to make a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for watershed protection in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 2680. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2681. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

WATERSHED PLANNING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR INDIANA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on March 12 I was one of an inspection group who flew by Convair and helicopter over the drought-stricken Ohio River area from Louisville to Evansville, Ind., and along the flooded Patoka River. The worst floods in 20 years have brought uncalculated damage, damage which would undoubtedly have been worse a few years ago before the progress in reservoirs and watershed development which has been made.

But the progress to date, Mr. President, has not been sufficient. I refer particularly to the watershed development under the Department of Agriculture conservation program. This program for work to prevent the kind of runoff which is a prime cause of floods such as we have seen is vital. To date 2 watershed projects in Indiana have been completed, work plans for 15 have been prepared, and 12 approved for operations.

This sounds like real progress. But alongside of this must be put the fact that in the State of Indiana a survey by the Department of Agriculture shows 182 areas which should be developed as watersheds. In order to proceed, a greater effort must be made in planning. Federal funds in fiscal 1964 for the two watershed planning parties for Indiana were $100,000, but this year's figure has been reduced to $85,000. The organization on the larger sum is geared to produce 6 to 8 work plans a year, but applications being received are from 12 to 15 a year. This is double the achievement on the present $100,000, which it is now proposed to reduce.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of the great need for flood protection in the State of Indiana as evidenced by the recent disastrous floods in the area, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a supplemental appropriation bill to remedy this situation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2679) to make a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for watershed protection in the State of Indiana, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sum is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Soil Conservation Service

Watershed Protection

For an additional amount for expenses necessary to conduct surveys, investigations, and research and to carry out preventive measures in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, approved August 4, 1954 (16 U.S.C. 1001–1008), and the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f), to remain available until expended, $100,000, and to be available only for such activities within the State of Indiana.

ANNUITY INCREASES NEEDED FOR RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide a 5-percent increase in annuity benefits for retired Federal employees and their survivors.

The plight of retired Federal employees who devoted a lifetime to Government service is a difficult one. Inflation is their great enemy, and the 5-percent annuity increase voted in 1962 by Congress was all too small.

Legislation is being actively promoted for pay increases for postal and Federal employees. It seems only fair that some increase be provided in annuity benefits for those Federal employees who have retired.

Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to introduce proposed legislation requested by the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, which actively and ably represents the needs and welfare of all retired Federal employees.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my re-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

marks a letter of March 19, 1964, to me from Glenn R. Simcox, president of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, which discusses the bill I have introduced.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2680) to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The letter presented by Mrs. NEUBERGER is as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1964

Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Wahsington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Enclosed is a draft of a bill to increase annuities paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund which we hope you will sponsor in the Senate.

Inflation is the greatest enemy of the retired employees of the Federal Government and their dependents and survivors who are trying to live on meager retirement annuities. Congress made an effort 2 years ago a bridge part of the gap between annuity dollars and the cost of living but the 5-percent adjustment effective as of January 1, 1963, was only about half enough to make ends meet.

The two outstanding changes in the Civil Service Retirement Act were made in 1948 and in 1956. The revisions in 1948 increased the annuity formula for persons who would retire in the future and also at the same time granted 25-percent increases in the annuities of most of those previously retired. On the other hand, the further revisions in the formula approved in 1956 for those who would retire in the future made no provision whatsoever for persons previously retired. It was not until 2 years later, in 1958, that a 10-percent increase was approved for persons retired before the effective date of the 1956 revisions.

In the meantime, salaries were rapidly climbing in both Government and private industry, and inflation was squeezing the purchasing power of annuity dollars. In 1962, when the Congress took up the bill to increase annuities, it adopted the base year of 1958, in determining that cost of living had then risen at least 5 percent, which overlooked a number of essential facts. The increase in 1958 was not a general adjustment of annuities, but only a belated correction of an adjustment neglected for 2 years. The real gap in cost-of-living deficiency started in 1956 and not in 1958.

We believe that an analysis of cost-of-living figures from July 1956 through December 1962 will disclose that there was an increase during that period of approximately 10 percent. One half of this gap was covered by the increase which became effective in 1963. We hope you will help us get a further adjustment to cover the rest of the gap.

If I, or any member of our staff can assist you or members of your staff at any time, please call upon us.

With best personal regards, and thanking you for the splendid cooperation we are always receiving from you, I am,

GLENN R. SIMCOX,
President.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF TUALATIN RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a rapid change in land and water uses in Washington County of Oregon has presented the people of that area with a critical problem. This particular section of Oregon is drained by the Tualatin River. The Tualatin is relied upon as the source of supply for irrigation of farms and orchards and for municipal and domestic water for a thickly populated and intensively farmed section near Portland, Oregon's largest city.

The water supply situation for all uses has become acute. However, some years ago the Bureau of Reclamation conducted a thorough-going investigation and determined that it would be feasible to build a storage dam at the Scoggins Creek site on the Tualatin River, thus assuring an adequate supply of water for the urban and rural demands of the area.

I have just received word that the Bureau of the Budget has given its approval to the proposed report on the Tualatin project by the Secreary of Interior. The Secretary's report which has received the approval of affected State and Federal agencies has found the Tualatin project on Scoggins Dam economically feasible. I am, therefore, introducing for myself and for my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

The Tualatin project plan of development provides for a 61,000-acre-foot reservoir behind the proposed Scoggin Dam to store excess wintertime flows of the river and release the water as needed for municipal and industrial supplies, irrigation, the maintenance of fish life in the river, flood control, and water quality control.

Included in the plan are some 70 miles of main canals and necessary pumping plants, laterals, drains, and appurtenant facilities to irrigate 17,000 acres of productive lands. Project facilities would provide for the foreseeable water needs of three cities in the project area and for other nonagricultural uses. Specific facilities would also be provided at Scoggin Reservoir for recreation and fish enhancement, and modifications at an existing downstream industrial diversion dam will insure the passage of anadromous fish.

Washington County cites of Hillsboro, Forest Grove, and Beaverton, Tigard Water District, as well as the Lake Oswego Corp., will require about 14,000 acre-feet of water annually from the project.

Construction cost of the Tualatin project is estimated at $19,235,300 of which $14,431,500 is reimbursable. Tentative allocations of the project cost to functions are as follows:

Irrigation, $13,089,000; municipal and industrial water supply, $1,342,500; water-quality control, $1,720,700; fish and wildlife, $1,977,200; recreation, $795,100; flood control, $30,800; highway transportation, $280,000.

Mr. President, this project has been strongly endorsed by the Oregon State Water Resources Board, as well as the local units of government concerned.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2681) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of March 16, 1964, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

S. 2635. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes: Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.

S. 2637. A bill to provide a new program for wheat and to provide a long-range program for the retirement of excess land from the production of agricultural commodities: Mr. BARTLETT.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Address delivered by John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General, at dedication of New York World's Fair Post Office, on March 11, 1964.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Article entitled "Look Into the Sea," published in the March 9, 1964, issue of Sports Illustrated, dealing with the subject of research on the biology fluctuations, status, and statistics of the migratory marine species of game fish of the United States and contiguous waters, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. HARTKE:

Articles relating to Miles Laboratories, published in the March 15, 1964, issue of Forbes magazine.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OBJECT TO COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. MORSE and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the Chair state what understanding or

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

agreement has been reached with regard to committee meetings being held during the sessions of the Senate, and whether there is any agreement that permits them to hold meetings during the Senate sessions without obtaining further unanimous-consent agreements daily from the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Committee on Appropriations is authorized to meet today only. The Committee on Rules and Administration has been authorized to meet for the remainder of the week. No other committees are authorized to meet while the Senate is in session.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon wishes to announce that, in the absence of any prior commitment, the senior Senator from Oregon will object to any committee hearings being held while the civil rights bill is before the Senate, at least for the time being.

I wish to explain why I make that statement. The Senate should either fish or cut bait. We should either follow orderly procedure or not. The civil rights bill should be referred to committee for 10 days. If that could be done, it would be possible for the Senate, in keeping with regular procedure, to conduct its business during that period of time. When the committee reported the bill back after 10 days, it would undoubtedly be made the pending business before the Senate, and we could get on to disposing of the proposed legislation.

With all respect to the disagreement Senators may have with the Senator from Oregon on this matter, I am convinced that the only way the Senate can dispose of the bill in a reasonable period of time is by directing its attention to it, and not doing anything else but work on the civil rights bill. Also this would result in directing the attention of the people of the country to the floor of the Senate and to the importance of passing a civil rights bill.

It is with some reluctance that I make this announcement. Nevertheless I am convinced, after observing civil rights fights in the Senate for many years, that when we get into this kind of situation, all the time and attention of the Senate should be directed to this issue. The Senate should not be transacting other business while the civil rights issue is before it.

I close by saying that every American should understand that this is a great, historic issue. The price of liberty comes high for everyone. I do not believe we can justify making exceptions for any group that wants this legislation, or that legislation, or some other legislation considered, when the job of every Senator is to be present on the floor of the Senate every moment of the time the Senate is in session until the civil rights bill is enacted.

Therefore, I announce to my leadership that I shall make it my business to see to it that I am on the floor of the Senate to raise objections. I hope, if I am not on the floor of the Senate, I may have the courtesy of a quorum call in order to give me an opportunity to raise an objection to any request for permission for a committee to meet while the Senate is in session.

Mr. MANSFIELD and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am indeed sorry to hear the statement just made by the Senator from Oregon. I do not know whether he knows it or not, but another Senator on the Democratic side has made it very plain that he would not accord the Appropriations Committee the usual courtesy of meeting during sessions of the Senate. This program has been in operation for many decades, and it is one committee which has been given that consideration because of the multiplicity of its duties.

I point out to the Senator that even yet, on this the 14th day, I believe, since the debate began, we are not considering the civil rights bill, but only the question of taking it up and making it the pending business.

I would hope that there would be some way by which arrangements could be arrived at whereby some of the other business of the Senate could be carried on by duly constituted committees, because if we stop everything for civil rights, it means that everything will be stopped, in my opinion, not for the weeks ahead but for the months ahead, and the business of the people in other respects will be neglected.

There is other business to attend to, even though this particular matter is of paramount importance at the moment.

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, the best way to get a civil rights bill before the Senate and to proceed to consider it is to do nothing but devote all our attention to the civil rights issue.

One of the reasons I shall object to committee hearings is that, in my judgment, it will help us get the civil rights bill before the Senate. Second, I have already intimated that I do not believe any other business should be transacted by the Senate until the matter of delivering the Constitution of the United States to the Negroes of America, for the first time in our history, is finally settled by the Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Even though I disagree very much with the Senator from Oregon in his announcement to the effect that he would oppose any committee meetings, I must in all honesty recognize that he is acting within his rights under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was somewhat confused as to why the Senator from Montana thought it was of such paramount importance that committees meet to consider run-of-the-mine legislation that is of little or no consequence, when he is not willing to have a committee even consider the civil rights bill, which he says is of paramount importance to the people of the country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator from Georgia will allow me to reply, I would point out that the majority leader did attempt to have the bill referred to committee and he did almost succeed in so doing. However, one objection was made, and the unanimous-consent request was thereby lost. So the attempt having been made, I believe it would be far better to get on with the business rather than to refer this proposal to the Judiciary Committee, where we know the kind of treatment it will receive.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was a rather pale attempt to get the bill before a committee for only a few days with the clear instructions of the Senate that the committee could not amend the bill, and could not make a recommendation with respect to it. I do not see that the committee hearings would serve any useful purpose with such an understanding

Mr. MANSFIELD. Pale or lurid, it was an attempt, and the attempt was defeated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let us see what happens in other areas such as the one in which the Senator from Oregon has given notice, which he is within his right

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very much disappointed to hear the distinguished Senator from Oregon make the statement that he has just made. Of course, I realize that he looks very fine and handsome in the great cloak of virtue which he has drawn over his shoulders and which he wears over his shoulders like a halo, except it is in the wrong place.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Colorado has the appearance of Apollo.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have all the respect in the world for the Senator from Oregon, but I should like to engage his attention for just a moment, to comment on the fact that last year the Senate was kept in session for 12 months, and that even during the month of December we were still trying to dispose of the appropriation bills.

Perhaps the distinguished Senator does not realize the amount of detail and the number of hours and weeks required to dispose of these bills.

If the Senator from Oregon is willing to remain into September, October, or November, and will attend Senate sessions every day while it is working on appropriation bills, his point is well taken.

But what we shall be doing, in effect, is slowing down the work of the Senate that must go on day by day, without waiting until July or August, because the people will be rendered a disservice if the Senate cannot dispose of appropriation bills.

The opinion of the Senator from Oregon may be that if there are no committee meetings civil rights legislation will be expedited. The Senator's position on civil rights is no stronger than mine, and I will not accord to him any credit in this field that I would not take for myself. But the Senate must transact

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

chief engineer to head the great construction project, he went to the railroads and found him in the person of John F. Stevens, 1873–1943, who in 1889 had made the dramatic discovery of Marias Pass, Mont., through which he had constructed the Great Northern Railroad.

In the preparation of a 1956 address on "John F. Stevens: Basic Architect of the Panama Canal" before the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C., I went deeply into the story of the life and achievements of this great pioneer engineer, which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 29, 1956.

In many ways a man of universal talents, Stevens left his mark on many lands as well as on his own, among them Panama, Russia, Siberia, and China.

It was therefore, with the greatest interest that I read a brief story of Stevens' discovery of Marias Pass, by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, in the March 16, 1964, issue of the Washington, D.C. Evening Star, which follows:

MARIAS PASS: BEST IN ROCKIES—ROUTE FOR TRAINS THROUGH MOUNTAINS FOUND BY MAN NAMED STEVENS IN 1889

(By Jenkins Lloyd Jones)

SPOKANE, WASH.—All day long the train roars westward across northern Montana.

Hour after hour the featureless plain rolls beneath the dome cars.

But ahead lies the wall of the Rockies. The Bear Paw Mountains, rising white in their snow mantle south of Havre, stand as the first sentinels. North of Chester the flatness is broken again by the Sweetgrass Hills. And, finally, in the afternoon sun, the frozen summits of Glacier Park shatter the horizon.

Now the wall is plain, stretching north and south as far as you can see. You can find no opening. But the train climbs toward it with confident purpose. It is heading for Marias Pass—the best of all the great passes through the American Rockies—and the last dicovered.

In the days of Lewis and Clark the Indians told of an easy route to the Great Ocean, but Lewis and Clark never found it. In the 1850's the U.S. Government, recognizing that the railway age was coming, grew interested in surveying the best route to the Pacific.

The southern route, southwest from Fort Smith, across the Comanche lands of Texas, through El Paso del Norte and on through the Apache country to California was easy—if you did not count the Comanches and Apaches.

The Santa Fe Trail with its extension along the 32d parallel was well known. So was the Mormon Trail up the North Plattee, over South Pass and to San Francisco via the Nevada desert. But routes over the northern Rockies were a puzzle.

In 1840 Robert Greenhow published a map showing the great pass right about where it really is. But no one paid much attention to Greenhow's map, an admitted guess.

All the time the Blackfeet Indians knew about the pass, but they feared it as the home of evil spirits and would guide no one there. As the Civil War clouds darkened, the Government gave up the search.

Thirty years went by. James J. Hill, the Canadian boy who started as a steamboat clerk in St. Paul, had become the "empire builder." The rails of the Great Northern had crawled west across the Dakota plains and Hill had driven them halfway across northern Montana to Havre, still hoping to find an easy way. But at Havre he paused, frustrated. His surveyors had returned discouraged. Reluctantly, he began laying rails southwest toward Helena.

As a last shot, in the late fall of 1889, he sent out a tough young engineer, John F. Stevens. Stevens could get no Indian guides. He pressed on blindly westward in the teeth of a deepening blizzard. Finally, he found a little river, named Marias 84 years before by Capt. Meriwether Lewis for his cousin, Maria. In the late afternoon he slogged through deep snow to its headwaters, crossed a low saddle and found the beginning of a creek that trended west and north. It proved to be a tributary of the Flathead which goes into the Kootenai. Marias Pass was found.

That night the temperature dropped to 40 below. He didn't dare cuddle in his blanket next to the fire. There was too much hazard of a sleep that leads to death. All night long he walked back and forth in the snow. The next day be struggled east. Within a week jubilant Jim Hill had his half-frozen coolies grading a right-of-way straight west from Havre.

The beautiful long train with its snaking dome cars passes the winter-closed Glacier Park Lodge and behind its full-throated diesels climbs through the snow sheds along the north bank of the Marias. There at the top, half buried in a drift, is the bronze statue of John F. Stevens in his stocking cap and fleece coat, staring out across his pass. The altitude—5,313 feet—the lowest railroad crossing of the Continental Divide north of the Southern Pacific.

The story of mankind, mostly, is a story of people who, like the Blackfeet, feared evil spirits and never even sought the better way. Beyond these are the fumbling seekers, the easily discouraged who blunder up the wrong approaches and tell the world that the better way is a phantom or the short-sighted and timid who suspect the truth but don't pursue it.

That's why civilization can never get enough John F. Stevenses, the men who brave the blizzards and stubbornly find the way.

The big diesels are silent now. The brakes screech on the curves. The "Empire Builder" glides easily down toward the big ocean.

UNFORTUNATE COMMENTARIES ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

(Mr. O'HARA of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some public commentary on a number of social problems in the United States often conveys the impression that the sins of a few are the sins of many. This unfortunate habit of transferring the minority's guilt to the majority leads to profound misunderstanding of many serious problems in American society and certainly obscures the constructive efforts of many dedicate Americans to overcome those problems.

To be specific, Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of my colleagues to the many unfortunate commentaries offered almost daily on juvenile delinquency. How easy it is for us to read about antisocial or criminal behavior in the younger set and attribute a tendency toward that behavior to most youngsters. How unjust and wrong it is for us to be caught up in this habit of generalization and oversimplification, particularly at the expense of a vast majority of junveniles whose behavior represents the best traditions of citizenship.

Seven years ago, the Macomb County, Mich., probation department launched a pioneer program to salvage the lives and future prospects of youthful offenders. The story of that admirable and constructive effort appears in a recent article by Staffwriter Leon Goldman, of the Mount Clemens Monitor Leader.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, this article serves as a much-needed reminder that 95 percent of our young people often accept the blame for a wayward 5 percent, and that those few who do run afoul of the law—at least in Macomb County—have a second chance to live useful lives thanks to the far-sighted efforts of the probation officers. Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Goldman's article in the RECORD so that other communities in America may benefit from the example of Macomb County:

HUMAN SALVAGE PROJECT SAVES COUNTY YOUTH

(By Leon Goldman)

All is not lost with the younger generation despite the impression created by the current uproar over juvenile delinquency.

At least, it isn't the situation in Macomb County.

You have the authoritative opinion of those in position to know whereof they speak.

In the first place—it is stressed—here, as elsewhere, only about 5 percent of the youth element can be classified as delinquent.

The other 95 percent behave themselves and are model citizens.

The good conduct of the overwhelming majority is overshadowed by the wayward few.

Even with those who have gone astray, all is not lost. Many can, and are being rehabilitated into good citizens through a "human salvage" program pioneered by Macomb County.

It is a special probation program put into motion 7 years ago by the county probation department. The date was January 2, 1957.

The "guidance without custody" system has since spread to many other counties in the State.

An average of 96 out of 100 beginning offenders a year in this county are now being channeled back into the straight and narrow through the process, statistics show.

Even the most cynical will concede that this is a creditable batting average in any league.

Reached to discuss and comment on the operation are three law-enforcement officials who have worked closely in administering the program.

They are Guy L. Brown, chief of the probation department; County Prosecutor George N. Parris; and County Police Justice Francis A. Castellucci.

This is the operation:

Probation in the lower court probation division is restricted to misdemeanor offenders, for which the maximum penalty is a $100 fine or 10 days in jail or both.

Probation is given in lieu of penalty. Minimum court costs and supervisory fees are paid, the fees going into the county's general fund.

Probationers involved are mainly in the age range from 17 to 20, primarily the youthful offender—both in years and in criminal experience.

Most are first offenders who appear headed for further trouble.

Prior to adoption of the system—to put emphasis on crime prevention and correction by placing a premium on future good behavior—the lower courts had to rely on fines and/or sentences, and let it go at that.

The prospect for the offender was graduation to felonies to be handled by the circuit courts. Prison loomed in the not-too-far distance.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

There were no direct means of providing guidance and supervision as a deterrent to further criminal activity. The offender paid the prescribed penalty and walked out of custody with no strings attached.

All municipal and justice courts in the county are now participating in the human salvage program.

Of significant value is a presentence investigation conducted by the probation department which provides the sentencing judge with family history and criminal background along with other pertinent data. Also included is a recommendation as to sentence.

This practice formerly had prevailed only in the handling of felony cases in circuit court.

In some nonviolent felony cases, where the offender appears to be good salvage material, Prosecutor Parris will permit addition of a misdemeanor count to the indictment. This permits the lower court to retain jurisdiction over the offender rather than binding over to circuit court on the higher count.

Three probation officers, all college trained, handle the lower court probation investigation and supervision under Brown.

They are Harry L. Haller, Paul R. Steele, both veterans of the service, and David E. Schmeiser, a comparative newcomer who divides his time between the upper and lower court divisions.

Significant are latest statistics which show that out of a total of 334 probationers supervised by the probation department for the lower courts in 1963, only 12 failed to meet requirements satisfactorily.

A total of 260 successfully completed probation and received honorable discharges.

Ten of the 12 who flunked probation were sentenced for new offenses.

Of those who failed to make good, only one absconded.

Statistics for the proceding year are comparable.

Other figures further attest to the worth of the probation process and the redemption of manpower.

Total earnings of probationers in the division in 1963 amounted to $407,816, reflecting the earning power unleashed in contrast with the incarceration and its attendant costs to the taxpayer.

"The system permits the individual to remain at home and support his family by working," Brown said, "rather than becoming a public liability."

He noted that approximately $11,000 was collected in court costs last year and turned over to the county's general fund.

An additional $4,000 in restitution was collected from the probationers and returned to those who had sustained the financial loss as a result of the crimes.

Moreover, the department collected approximately $4,500 in family support and handed it over to families of the offenders.

The latter, Brown explained, involved cases of criminal neglect of family in which there is no divorce or decree pending and which would not come under the jurisdiction of the friend of the court.

For the most part, older individuals are involved, in the domestic cases, said Brown, adding:

"Generally speaking, youth predominates. I think you will find that situation is true across the Nation. Nipping youthful criminal tendencies in the bud means fewer adult offenders later. Naturally, we are extremely pleased with our results."

Brown went on to comment:

"I don't think there is a county in Michigan that has a better working relationship between law enforcement agencies than we do. I don't think either that we are getting any more crime in Macomb County per capita today than we had 20 years ago.

"Being one of the fastest growing counties in the Nation, naturally crime is keeping pace."

On the other hand, noted the probation chief, increased law enforcement personnel and improved means of crime detection have made it "more difficult to get away with anything."

Brown praised cooperation of the lower courts and the prosecutor's office for making the program "work."

He termed Justice Castellucci's court as "our biggest supplier."

Justice Castellucci referred 133 of the 291 cases handled by the lower court probation division last year. The next highest number was 33, referred by Utica Justice Richard C. Stavoe.

They were among 22 municipal judges and justices who made use of the service.

The others were:

Judges: Malcolm E. Trombley, Mount Clemens; Edward J. Gallagher and Verne C. Boewe, Warren; Herman L. Brys, St. Clair Shores; Raymond R. Cashen and Mary E. McDevitt, Roseville; Martin J. Smith and Harold H. Heins, East Detroit, and John O'Hara, Harper Woods (transfer case).

Justices: Joseph P. Plutter, Shelby; George F. Bunker and Gordon E. Havey, Sterling; Harold L. Lemmer and Henry Klos, Chesterfield; James C. Schocke, Bruce; John E. Donahue, Clinton; Bronson Hill, Armada; Paul Mabley, Richmond, and Thomas W. McDonell, Fraser.

Much of Castellucci's volume stems from the geographical location of his court in the county seat of Mount Clemmens. It is locacated in the same building that houses the county jail and the sheriff's department.

Castellucci, a resident of Romeo and a veteran attorney, is examining magistrate at the jail.

Castellucci, presently serving as president of the Macomb County Bar Association, commented:

"You hear everywhere that the kids are going to pot. Our figures and experience don't reflect that.

"I wouldn't go so far as to say 'there are no bad boys.' There are plenty. I have seen them. But you will find most have redeeming qualities. It's a matter of getting it out of them."

Boys outnumber girls more than five to one in the commission of criminal offenses, the statistics show. Most of the offenses involving women are of the shoplifting variety.

Lauding the junior probation system, Justice Castellucci asserted:

"It's working. You can't argue with success of a system that salvages 96 out of 100 offenders. Look at it this way. Last year only 12 out of 334 probationers failed to make good. Were it not for the system, we would be working with a 334 potential."

He added that the figures are "fairly constant."

The county is blessed, Justice Castellucci said, with have a probation department and allied agencies that understand the problem and are willing to do something about it.

"The easy way out would be to pass sentence of a fine or jail and let it go at that. That's only avoiding the problem. You haven't accomplished a thing."

He added:

"I think I can speak for all in saying that it's highly gratifying to look back over a year's work and know that you have figured in saving 96 out of 100 fellows who have gone astray.

"For me," he continued, "it has been extra rewarding to look back through files and see letters of appreciation from those who have been helped.

"They tell you how they have made good in school, college, or out in the business world. They also tell you of their homes and families, and of their determination that their children will benefit from knowledge of the difference between right and wrong that they learned themselves the hard way."

Noting that figures reflect a sharp reduction in felonies by youthful offenders in the county last year, Castellucci said much credit can be given to the part the program has played in cutting down on "repeaters."

In assessing the success of the program, Justice Castellucci praised the prosecutor's office for its cooperation in saving many of the offenders felony records by a realistic and humane approach to the problem

He summed up the secret of the program's success in a line: "Cooperation and rigid supervision."

Prosecutor Parris had this to say:

"When I came into office, one of my ambitions was to strive for rehabilitation of youthful offenders, and to keep them separated from hardened criminals.

"With the cooperation of the probation department, under the excellent guidance of Guy L. Brown, Justice Francis A. Castellucci, and the other municipal judges and justices handling criminal cases, we have been successful beyond expectation.

"My policy of allowing first offenders who commit nonviolent felonies—those who are deserving of a break and who have a good chance for rehabilitation to plead to a misdemeanor has worked out exceptionally well.

"A youthful first offender who can be rehabilitated and can become a good citizen of our society needs the assistance immediately after commission of his first felony.

"To convict a youngster of a felony," the prosecutor continued, "practically shuts the door of future hopes and dreams in his face."

He then stressed:

"Of course, anyone committing violent crimes deserves and our office prosecutes to the fullest extent of the law. Our records are indicative of a successful policy."

Resuming comment on the office's attitude toward rehabilitation of youthful offenders, Parris stated:

"The latest probation department statistics makes me more determined than ever to continue this humane and beneficial policy of special consideration for those deemed deserving. Society and the individual are both tremendously benefited.

"Incarceration in jail or prison costs approximately $2,500 a year per inmate, whereas probation costs are virtually nil since the probationer pays probation and court costs. Restitution is generally ordered by the court as part of the sentence.

He then concluded:

"The greatest asset of all is the salvation of these youngsters—since prison means in more than 40 percent of the cases a repetition in a life of crime against society."

FEDERAL PAY RAISE BILL

(Mr. SICKLES (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee is seeking to revive a major portion of the Federal pay raise bill which the House recently failed to approve.

It is extremely important that the sections of this legislation providing pay raises for 1.7 million Federal employees be approved. There are two basic reasons for this.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

First, for those in the lower and middle grades of the salary spectrum, Congress must act to keep faith with a principle of comparability established in the Federal Pay Act of 1962.

For those in the upper salary brackets, it is necessary that Congress raise salary ceilings that now exist in the Federal Establishment. If pay raises are not approved for this group the Government may lose some of its best managerial talent. Inaction could induce the flight of top-level employees to private industry and also greatly reduce the "in house" capacity of the Government to conduct research projects and other activities that require services of skilled professional and scientific personnel.

While, in my view, an increase in the level of congressional salaries is desirable, the provisions to accomplish this purpose in the pay bill which was defeated last week are expendable. I believe that the 435 Members of the House would sacrifice a personal salary increase, however desirable it may be, to insure the passage of legislation which concerns 1.7 million Federal employees and affects the ability of the Federal Government to attract and retain competent civil servants. Therefore, it is my hope that we can take favorable definitive action on pay legislation before adjournment.

(Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PATMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PATMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PATMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WILLIAM SCOTT STEWART

(Mr. LIBONATI (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, William Scott Stewart, noted Chicago criminal lawyer, died of a heart condition on March 8, in Miami, Fla. He was in retirement since July 1963. In recent years he appeared primarily in appellate jurisdictions in criminal causes before the several courts of appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court. His briefs reflected in every respect the work of a master in this field.

He was a graduate of John Marshall Law School and later in his career, filled a professorship in criminal law there. He was admitted to the bar in 1911. His fame as a prosecutor in the early twenties—on States Attorney Robert E. Crowe's staff—gained for him the appellation as "the hanging prosecutor." He sent to the gallows such noted criminals as Harvey W. Church, Carl Wanderer, Harry Ward, and Frank Legrandi—and got death sentences and long prison terms against many others.

After resigning in 1923, he became a defense lawyer wherein he became equally as famous as a trial lawyer as he had been on the side of the prosecution. He acted as counsel for William Darling Shepherd, tried in 1925 for the typhoid germ murder of William Nelson, McClintock, Roger Touhy in the kidnaping of John—Jake the Barber—Factor. Won acquittal for Touhy in St. Paul, Minn., on charges arising in the kidnaping of William Hamm of the brewery family. Other clients included "Golf Bag" Hunt and many others.

For the better part of two decades Stewart was active and acted as Chicago chairman of the civil liberties committee and for a time as president of the International Committee for Human Rights.

It is not necessary for a lawyer to be an orator to be a brilliant criminal attorney. Nor is it the orator who attacks the minds of the jury for the weighing of the evidence in their deliberations.

William Scott Stewart was not an orator, but he was a brilliant lawyer in the knowledge of the law and gained a national reputation as a trial lawyer in criminal cases. His active mind gave him depth in determining errors in the record, of faults in the technical procedures, in causes before the trial court. He was an authority in the interpretation of the law of evidence—and had a comomnsense approach to the presentment of argument to the court, in explaining the intricacies of the introduction of evidence or documents under the cardinal rules.

William Scott Stewart, as a respected law school professor, never fully abandoned the meticulous scholastic approach to legal problems.

A few fellows around the criminal court building in Chicago, who have watched the changes in the breed of men who weigh out justice and fill the roles of the prosecution and the defense—know now that the thinning ranks of the actor-lawyer types, on both sides of the table—casting their flippant remarks and innuendoes—stirring up dramatic scenes and humorous incidents—all done to influence the jury as actors before an audience, are gone forever—except for the few remaining now in retirement.

Many of Scott's friends of the early days are gone now—passing through the portals of life to their destiny in the Promised Land.

Nate Gross and Bensinger of Chicago's American; Hildy Johnson, Morning Examiner; and Jim Doherty of the Tribune; Art Summerfield, Clem Lane, and Enoch Johnson of the Daily News. The now-retired, distinguished George Wright of the Chicago Daily Tribune, and Ted Todd, retired of Chicago's American, and Congressman Roman Pucinski of the Sun-Times were celebrated reporters of that era.

The members of the famous criminal bar at that period were Miles Devine, Patrick O'Donnell, Clarence Darrow, Frank McDonald, George Crane, Wilbur Crowley (Judge), Erbstein, Brodkin, Bellows, Petrone, Stewart, Nicosia, Love, Bulger, Brody, E. M. Libonati, Busch, Meyers, the Devine brothers, Schultz, Barbaro Scalise, the Stillo brothers, Altieri, Billy Smith, Ropes O'Brien, Milton Smith, Michael Romano, Emmett Byrne, Harold Levy, Judge Austin, Alex Napoli, Congressmen Edward Finnegan, Barratt O'Hara, Bieber, and Covelli.

Among the outstanding members of the bench were O'Connell, Dougherty, Butler, Crowley, Hartigan, Lupe, Sharbaro, Pope, Cilella, Barth, Geroulis, Cornelius Harrington, Morrissey, Quilici, Greene, Dunne, McDermott, Chelos, Drucker McSweeney, Kula, McCormick, Covelli, Austin, Weiss, Padden, Casey, Normoyle, Wells, Dempsey, Barry, Robson, Holmgren, Roberts, Kluczynski, Ward, Burke, Bicek, Tucker, Leonard, Kiley, Touhy, Lyons, Adesko, Stanton, Helander, Jacobs, Hayes, and Rooney.

He is survived by his son, William Scott Stewart III, a Navy commander; a daughter, Mrs. Mary Welch; three brothers and two sisters.

The Illinois congressional delegation extends to the family our heartfelt condolences on their loss.

HAWAII: STATEHOOD ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. GILL (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, statehood is still new enough to us in Hawaii for its anniversary to be an occasion. I think an anniversary of this sort should have two purposes: First, of course, we should once again express to the leadership and to our friends in Congress, our continuing gratitude for your gift of full citizenship. We should also express our hope that those who represent the 50th State in these Halls have lived up to your expectations. Second, and most important, we owe this Congress a report on what we as a State have been able to accomplish since statehood, and what we have yet to do.

Let me speak briefly at the second point.

There was some concern at the time the statehood bill was being considered, whether Hawaii could stay afloat economically as a State. You need have no fear. Total personal income has continued to rise from about $1.3 billion in 1959 to about $1.68 billion at the end of 1963. Gross State product at the end of 1963 was estimated to be about $2 billion, a 5.2-percent increase over 1962. In the preceding 2 years, 1960–62, the gross State product had increased at an average annual rate of 5.7 percent. These gross figures do not indicate much detail, but they do show our steady growth in almost all areas.

Hawaii is still heavily dependent on Federal spending and undoubtedly will continue to be because of our strategic military position. However, our contributions to the Federal Treasury have

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

also risen. For example, we paid $232,300,000 in Federal taxes in 1960; this rose to $283,700,000 in 1962 and is still going up. While a recent study of the Tax Foundation, Inc., showed that in 1962 Hawaii put in 50 cents for every $1 received, it also showed that 10 States put in a smaller percentage.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, Hawaii is pulling its share of the load, and, further, is developing at a rate substantially faster than the average for the rest of the Nation.

But we have a long way to go.

We must have a far broader economic base. We must serve as the educational, cultural, and economic hub for the Pacific area, and here we have only made a start. With the help of Congress and the State Department our East-West Center has become known across the Pacific and in parts of Asia as a successful new experiment in cultural and technical interchange; but here too we must regroup and redefine our objectives so that people in Washington can better understand our mission. Our racial harmony has long been a byword, and indeed we have done better in this area than most parts of the Nation; however, we also need improvement and we further need to relate our experiences in some fashion which will help the more troubled sections of our country.

On balance, Mr. Speaker, I think we are meeting our responsibilities and the trust you placed in us by granting statehood. And we expect to better this in the years ahead. It is our pride that our people, to borrow the phrase of our late President, are inclined to first ask what they can do for their country. May this always be our guiding principle.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

(Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, more than 1,000 citizens of Hawaii will join tonight to partake of a hundred-dollar-a-plate dinner at the Royal Hawaiian Monarch Room in Honolulu to celebrate the Fifth Anniversary of Hawaiian statehood. The Honorable Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, Governor of the State of California, will deliver the principal address. The affair is being sponsored by the Democratic Party of Hawaii.

It was 5 years ago, on March 18, 1959, that President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed the Hawaii statehood bill into law, making our Paradise Isles the 50th State in the Union. This great body of the Congress had passed the bill on March 12, and the Senate had approved it the day before.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call the attention of this august body to this event because I am convinced that the granting of statehood to Hawaii is one of the greatest things that this Congress has done in this Nation's entire history. Let us just pause a moment to think about it. Out there in the middle of the expansive Pacific Ocean, more than 2,000 miles off the coast of California, lies a chain of islands represented by almost invisible specks on the map of the world. Who in his sane mind would ever have thought that these islands would some day became a full-fledged State in the Union of States? It was only through the extraordinary courage and bold imagination of the Members of the 86th Congress, many of whom are still serving in this body and in the Senate, that Hawaii's dream of more than half a century became a reality.

How has Hawaii fared in its first 5 years as the 50th State of the Union? The Honorable John A. Burns, Hawaii's last delegate to Congress, who is credited with having carried the ball over the statehood goal line, and who is presently Governor of Hawaii, has praised the people of Hawaii for having proven "in every possible way their willingness and readiness to assume the responsibilities of a sovereign State." He points with particular pride to the "new political maturity that has been demonstrated by our people." He says that Hawaii's people "have much to be proud of and much to look forward to," and foresees a greater role of leadership for Hawaii in the field of commercial and cultural exchange between the United States and the Pacific-Asian nations.

Hawaii's people are willing to accept this leadership. They are not asking that the rest of the Nation do something for them; they are offereing their unique qualifications and geography of their State for full exploitation by the Uinted States.

As it has been repeatedly said by anthropologists, sociologists, poets, and politicians, Hawaii is "a showcase of American democracy." There in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, peoples of different races and cultures have proven by actual experimentation that they can live together in harmony and understanding for their mutual betterment. Our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy, recognized this, for when he delivered his first major civil rights speech in Honolulu on June 8, 1963, he told his listeners that he had chosen Hawaii as his platform because "Hawaii is what the United States is striving to be."

The first 5 years of statehood has been of proven benefit to the people of Hawaii, but of greater importance is the fact that Hawaii has been able to make unique contributions to the Nation as a whole. Hawaii's people have proven themselves to be our greatest assets in our struggle to win and maintain the friendship of the Afro-Asian countries. The East-West Center for Cultural and Technical Exchange in Honolulu has worked exceptionally well in the multicultural atmosphere of Hawaii and is fast proving to be one of the best investments in peace that our Nation has ever made. Peace Corps trainees too have found Hawaii an excellent training ground.

What I am trying to say here is that as a nation we must to a greater extent avail ourselves of the benefits that can be derived from the ideal geographic location and climate of the 50th State and the unique character and qualifications of its citizenry. We might begin by establishing a free port and international trade complex on Sand Island, as proposed by Governor Burns, to promote commercial intercourse and cultural exchange among the nations of the great Pacific basin.

On this, the fifth anniversary of Hawaiian statehood, the grateful citizens of Hawaii are ready and willing to continue to serve the United States in its great effort toward peace in a better world

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CLYDE HERRING SHOULD BE RETAINED ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to insert their remarks on the subject of my special order, which is the dismissal of Mr. Clyde E. Herring.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when the President made his announcement he was going to fill some of the top echelon positions in Government with women, I had no reason to disapprove. I favor making the most of the abilities of all qualified citizens, regardless of sex. I have supported equal rights legislation—in fact, I introduced a bill which would help accomplish this.

It is apparent now that the President's announcement was prompted for political reasons as much as any other. All of us can now claim this with more certainty. In this presidential election year, it is important for him to bolster his image wherever he can, so if he can wrap up a few votes in the name of American womanhood, it is only natural that he would move in that direction.

Whenever there is a vacancy which a qualified woman can fill, I find no fault in bringing her into a Government position. In fact, all other factors being equal, I am sure I would support it.

There is one proposed change, however, to which I strenuously object because all other factors are not equal. That is the replacement for Clyde E. Herring, of Iowa, one of the Commissioners on the Interstate Commerce Commission. The President has recommended that Mr. Herring be replaced by Mrs. Virginia Mae Brown, of West Virginia. Apparently as soon as this appointment is confirmed by the Senate, Mrs. Brown will take over as one of the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

We hope that our appeal to the courts for justice on behalf of the oversea schools will awaken the Defense Department to its responsibilities to its teachers. Most of all, we hope it will awaken the Defense Department to its responsibilities to the 150,000 American children whose parents have been assigned to oversea duty. We appreciate fully the tremendous burden carried by our Defense Department in its primary mission.

We trust that ultimately the equity in this case, involving only a tiny proportion of the Defense Department's worldwide operations and financial resources, will be recognized by the responsible officials of the department.

The Federal Government Cannot Afford Not To Raise Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues—particularly those who voted against the pay bill—the following editorial from the New York Times of March 15, 1964:

INCREASING FEDERAL PAY

A shortsighted and small-minded coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats has voted down a salary-increase bill in the House of Representatives, but this decision should not be permitted to stand. The bill can and should be revived through action initiated either in the House or Senate.

The measure which deserves this second chance would raise by an average of about 5 percent the pay of a million and a half white-collar classified employees and postal workers. It would increase by somewhat more than this the pay of Cabinet members and of other top-level Federal officials, and of all Federal judges. It would lift the salaries of Members of Congress from $22,500 to $32,500. The annual cost of the whole plan would be $545 million. It would be worth it.

It would be worth it because it is good economy to pay salaries high enough to attract topnotch men and women into Federal office and to keep them there in the face of increased competition for their services. One of the most familiar, and discouraging, stories in Washington is the loss by one Federal agency after another of public servants who are doing an excellent job, who like their work and want to go on with it, but who feel compelled to turn elsewhere for a better income.

It is perfactly conceivable that there will be an exodus from Washington of high-quality officials who cannot afford to stay unless a bill of this kind is passed. They should not be asked to make the financial sacrifice they are making—and this comment applies particularly to those in the upper levels of Government.

In the case of Members of Congress, there is a particularly strong argument for higher salaries. This is the desirability of freeing Congressmen from the need or the temptation of supplementing their Federal pay by outside work which may easily involve a conflict of interest with thir legislative work. A genuinely hard-working Congressman, ready and equipped to face intelligently and conscientiously each piece of public business as it arises, is worth every bit of $32,500.

No petty political considerations should be allowed to block reconsideration of this bill.

Bank Interlocks Should Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 8 of the Clayton Act as it relates to bank interlocks. Section 8 forbids interlocking directorates among corporations generally, and it also contains special provisions relating to bank interlocks.

The bill I introduced today would bring the bank interlock provisions of section 8 up to date by prohibiting interlocks through officers, directors, agents, trustees, employees, and substantial stockholders between banks subject to regulation by the Federal banking agencies and other commercial banks, savings banks, trust companies and savings and loan associations. This prohibition is qualified by certain exceptions in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Federal banking agencies.

The general interlock provisions of section 8 were enacted in 1914 and have remained unchanged ever since, despite the vast changes which have taken place in our commercial practices and our expanding economy. The business enterprises of 1914 were mere prototypes of today's huge, diversified, interdependent corporations.

Comparable changes have occurred in our banking structure. Yet, the bank interlock provisions were last amended in 1935.

I am convinced the time has come for a fresh look at interlocks generally—their nature, extent, and effect on competition and on our business and financial structure. I am equally convinced that clarification and strengthening of existing law is long overdue.

Interlocks pose three dangers: First, they provide a golden opportunity to restrain competition both through the exchange of plans and information, and through the exercise of common control or influence over two or more competing enterprises. Second, they are a fertile breeding ground for conflicts of interest. No man can serve two masters, and the interlocking officer, director or controlling stockholder cannot give the last full measure of devotion to the conflicting interests of two competing enterprises. Third, where leading businessmen undertake directorships of many different enterprises, it becomes increasingly difficult to give to each the time and attention it deserves and often chronic absenteeism results.

The need to revise section 8 as it applies to bank interlocks is widely recognized. The provisions of section 8 relating to bank interlocks were enacted at a time when the power of the Congress respecting interstate commerce and financial institutions was much more in doubt than it is today, and at a time when the activities of financial institutions were generally more limited than they are now. As a result, the provisions of section 8 regarding bank interlocks are quite unrealistic in today's economy. For instance, section 8 does not presently prohibit interlocking relationships between commercial banks and savings banks or between banks and savings and loan associations, or between those banking institutions and insurance companies, even though they may compete directly for deposits or investments, for mortgage financing and other types of financial activity.

On September 17, 1962, a distinguished Advisory Committee, consisting largely of leading bankers, made the following recommendation to the Comptroller of the Currency:

Interlocking directorates:

The financial structure of the Nation needs to be guarded against conflicts of interest. This means that the law and its application by the supervisory authorities should restrict interlocking directorates, and not only between competing commercial banks (as is now the case) but also between commercial banks and certain other types of competing financial institutions, notably, mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations. As presently interpreted, the law prohibits various specific types of interlocking directorates as between member banks but does not similarly restrict interlocks involving other classes of financial institutions to the extent desirable. Hence, there is a clear need for legislation dealing with this problem.

The prohibitions of the present law on interlocking directorates should be made applicable between banks, savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks, whether chartered under Federal or State law.

Even more recently, on April 10, 1963, a Presidential Committee on Financial Institutions, composed of the principal officers of the executive branch concerned with banking, likewise recommended:

Section 8 of the Clayton Act has two parts. The first part, which applies only to banks, prohibits (with exceptions) interlocking relationships between member banks of the Federal Reserve System and other banks in the same or a nearby community. But interlocking relationships among nonmember banks, savings and loan associations, and other financial institutions are not covered by the law. Mutual savings banks are explicitly exempted, as are relationships involving a member bank if the banks are not located in the same or "contiguous" or "adjacent" city, town, or village. The Committee sees no reason why these limitations on interlocking relationships should apply only to member banks.

Although the second part of section 8 deals with corporations in general, it contains a reference to banks and is therefore pertinent to the work of the committee. * * * It might be interpreted, however, as exempting an interlocking directorate between a bank and a competing financial institution even though the latter type of interlocking relationships is not covered by the first part of section 8. This committee believed that the Clayton Act needs clarification in this respect.

Conclusion 21: The Committee believes that the provisions of section 8 of the Clayton Act which govern interlocking relationships involving financial institutions should be clarified and probably strengthened.

The bill I introduced today is designed to fill these gaps in the bank interlock provisions of section 8.

While I am not introducing a bill on this subject today, comparable inade-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

quacies and anachronisms exist in the provisions of section 8 which relate to interlocking relaitonships between commercial and industrial corporations generally.

These provisions are presently confined to interlocking directorates between competing corporations. This leaves glaring deficiencies. Section 8 does not prohibit one man from acting as an officer of more than one competing company, or as an officer of one and a director of another competing corporation. It does not apply to interlocks between supplier and buyer. Nor does it apply to a common controlling stockholder of two competing companies. It fails to cover indirect interlocks between competitors through a common lender.

Section 8, in a word, is as full of holes as swiss cheese. Its shortcomings have been highlighted again and again in reports by Government agencies charged with antitrust enforcement, by the Antitrust Subcommittee on the Select Committee on Small Business of this House and by legal scholars and experts.

Thus existing law leaves the door wide open to interlocking relationships between the managers of our great industrial, commercial, and financial enterprises. The twin dangers of widespread restraints of trade and conflicts of interest are obvious. As Mr. Justice Douglas, has observed:

> The web that is woven may tie many industries, insurance companies, and financial houses together into a vast and friendly alliance that takes the edge off competition. *United States* v. *W. T. Grant Co.*, 343 U.S. 629, 637 (dissenting opinion).

Accordingly, I have directed the staff of the House Antitrust Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, to undertake a study of interlocking relationships between our major industrial, commercial, and financial companies, and to survey the American business establishment.

I am also considering legislation to plug the loopholes in existing general interlock law.

The House Should Reconsider and Pass the IDA Bill—A Chance To Regain Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 26, 1964

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, an increase in the funds available to the International Development Association for loans is very much in the national interest of the United States. I hope that the House will reconsider its refusal on February 25, 1964, to authorize American participation in increasing IDA's funds.

I urge the Members to take note of the cogent arguments in favor of the IDA bill in the following editorial from the American Banker of March 17, 1964:

CHANCE TO REGAIN LEADERSHIP

The House of Representatives has proved itself pennywise and pound foolish in voting to cut off U.S. contributions to the multinational International Development Agency, the soft-loan adjunct of the highly successful World Bank.

But the House is to be given a chance to reconsider, in hearings before its Committee on Banking and Currency next week; and the men most concerned with the Nation's foreign economic policy are making every effort to restore U.S. support to this valuable agency.

They deserve every encouragement.

The IDA, a comparatively new organization, formed in 1960, was designed specifically to develop useful loans from the accumulation of local currencies which have been generated by the World Bank in its global activities, and to use these funds for the necessary type of development loan which is not bankable by the high World Bank standards, but which is necessary to supplement the projects which the World Bank does finance.

An example would be an IDA loan in local currency to build the access roads for a fertilizer plant built with World Bank aid.

The United States took a major role in the creation of the IDA, and committed itself to continue this leadership as a financial catalyst, mobilizing not only the financial resources, but also the hopes and enthusiasms of the less developed nations. The whole purpose of the IDA has been to generate low-interest, long-term credits, on the easiest possible terms and in the most available currencies. It was, in effect, specifically designed to be soft.

With the exertion of powerful U.S. leadership, 90 nations joined the IDA; 16 of them, in addition to the United States, agreed to shoulder the main burden of support. Last year, this country maintained its leadership by agreeing to supply $312 million of the $750 million the association needed to do its work for the year.

Now the House of Representatives has voted to pull back this commitment; if that reversal sticks, the country will be embarrassed in a most sensitive area, and this valuable organization almost surely will collapse.

The sad thing about the House action is that it struck at one of the most realistic, farsighted, and workable extensions of U.S. leadership in the aid field.

The whole emphasis of the U.S. aid program in recent years has been toward assisting the undeveloped to get to their economic feet, and toward getting other nations, both developed and underdeveloped to take up more of the load. The IDA was designed to aid this process, and has been effective in doing so already during its short life.

Particularly valuable in the IDA concept is its principle of multinationality. By operating through the IDA, the United States does not go into these underdeveloped nations as a hard-eyed lender, demanding certain reforms. Rather, the loan is processed, and the terms established, by a group of the borrower's peers. The immediate identification with the United States is dissipated, and the job accomplished without specific resentment being aimed at this country.

It is not enough to observe that the Johnson administration was caught by surprise by the vote of the House, by 208 to 188, to end U.S. support for the IDA. It should also be noted that the administration appeared to have regarded approval of the modest IDA appropriation as rather routine, for the chief administration witness in favor of the bill was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John C. Bullitt.

Next week, as the House Banking Committee takes up the IDA bill again, the administration will send up its big guns, in the persons of Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of the Treasury Douglas.

Their support should be enough to recover the lost initiative.

But it is to be hoped that the administration has learned a valuable lesson from this near setback which still can be averted. Given the brisk and politically invigorating climate for cost cutting in Government which now envelops Capitol Hill, the administration has to protect with special vigilance those programs which are good but not large, and which might be blown away in a puff of misdirected frugality.

Soft on Sukarno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, one reason our foreign aid program is in such trouble in the Congress of the United States is the deliberate insistence of the administration to be soft on Sukarno.

To show how deeply this cuts into the thinking of free nations, the Washington Daily News tells us how the people of democratic Malaysia are disappointed by our treatment of a tyrant.

The article follows:

"SOFT ON SUKARNO" BAFFLES MALAYSIANS—WORRIED ABOUT U.S. POSITION

(By W. D. Friedenberg)

KUALA LUMPUR, March 18.—The Government of newly independent democratic Malaysia is baffled and disappointed by the American policy of being "soft on Sukarno," Indonesia's saber-rattling president.

Ever since the farflung Federation was forged last September, it has been preoccupied with defending itself against Indonesia's avowed efforts to "crush Malaysia."

Here in Malaysia's lush, hilly capital, officials express confidence that Britain, former colonial tutor and now a Commonwealth partner, will continue to provide troops to help hunt down Indonesian guerrillas in Malaysia's North Borneo territories.

INFILTRATION

They expect no all-out Indonesian attack. But they fear continued guerrilla operations against Borneo and infiltration, sabotage, and subversion in Malaya and Singapore will force Malaysia to divert its scarce resources from development to defense and thus undermine the nation both economically and politically.

The Malaysians are convinced Indonesia will keep up its crush-Malaysia campaign until the United States orders a halt. They argue only the United States with its diplomatic arm-twisting strength, foreign aid leverage and the power of its 7th Fleet, can persuade Sukarno to be a good neighbor.

SUPERFICIAL

The Malaysians regard Attorney General Robert Kennedy's recent cease-fire mission as well intentioned but superficial, and they think the U.S. peacemaker role is ineffective if not unbecoming.

Says one Malaysian official privately: "Washington knows Malaysia is no British neocolonialist plot as Djakarta accuses, and knows which side is the aggressor in Borneo.

"If you can force Khrushchev to back down in Berlin and Cuba, why can't you help us straighten out Sukarno?"

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

but they will not be able to trade on the advertising efforts of the manufacturer and the sales efforts of the small merchant. The buyer will then have to make certain that what he is getting is worth the price.

The American market has been flooded with shoddy goods in the past years. I myself have bought clothing at discount houses for discount prices, lulled by the display of brand names into believing that a high level of quality was being maintained. The clothing when to pieces in a fifth of the usual time. I therefore bought 20 percent of product at what, in this instance, was 80 percent of the price.

The bargain was more apparent than real. This is what the quality stabilization bill is about—the "low prices" that are really higher.

The Beef and Sheep Men Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, cattlemen throughout the Nation are deeply disturbed over the question of meat imports, and their concern is most understandable. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the April 1964, edition of the Farm Journal:

THE BEEF AND SHEEP MEN PAY

"I am pleased," said Secretary Freeman of the voluntary agreement this country has just completed with Australia and New Zealand over meat imports. Judging by the cries of anger from the cattle and sheep country, he must be the only one who is.

The agreement allows these countries to ship in as much beef (and the Australians as much mutton) as the average for 1962–63. That's 6 percent less than in 1963 but 10 percent more than in 1962. Furthermore they get an increase of 3.7 percent for the next 2 years, so by 1966 they'll be sending us more than in 1963.

What the agreement amounts to is that things won't get worse but neither can they get much better.

U.S. stockmen wanted imports set at the average of 1958–63 period, or about half as much as now. Probably we could have gotten it. Why, then, was the level set so high? Simply because our Government has been trying to promote the idea of "sharing markets" around the world. We're about to go to the meeting of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) at Geneva, Switzerland, to sell the "sharing" idea. Our negotiators wouldn't want to admit that we ourselves had just put up the bars against anything. So the stockmen of the United States have been offered up as a sacrifice in our attempt to free up international trade. It's not surprising that they don't care for the role.

The cattlemen's plight is simply this: They sent 7 percent more beef to market in 1963 than in the 1958–62 period. Exports added another 1 percent. But our market can absorb an increase of only 3.5 to 4 percent without harm to prices. We brought on most of the trouble ourselves, by sending 1.25 million more cattle to market than the year before and making them an average of 19 pounds heavier (33 pounds for steers). We're keeping a record 106.5 million head out in the country, and a higher percentage of them than usual are cows, ready to produce more calves.

However, that's not the whole difficulty. At the very time of our acute distress, the Australians and New Zealanders were rushing an unprecedented quantity of meat here. In 1958, the Australians sold us only 18 million pounds of beef, but by 1963 were sending 517 million. Imports now furnish 11 percent of our entire supply. Our market has paid by far the highest prices in the world, and it has been wide open. Our tariff of 3 cents a pound has amounted to nothing.

Meanwhile, other governments are offering their farmers more protection, not less. We got a foretaste of what the Common Market intends in the "Chicken War," which we lost. Now Western Europe is trying to keep our feed grains out. Britain has recently established import quotas, as well as import prices, on both beef and pork to protect her stockmen. That's the way the rest of the world is "sharing."

It's against that picture that our Government, in an attempt to set a shining example which no one is following, permits meat imports at record levels. This, by the way, is the same Government that recently wanted to graze retired cropland acres because "we need more meat."

Actually, should we get a drought we could have a real disaster on our hands. Our import agreement can't be abrogated without 6 months' notice. We'd better all pray for rain.

What can cattlemen do about it? Well, first they will have to send less beef to market. Second, they can keep pressure on Congress and the White House for tougher import controls, even though denied them now. Third, they can refuse to be quieted by a little beef buying for school lnuch programs and a Tariff Commission hearing, now likely to be meaningless. Failing all else they can resort to the ballot box next fall. That's one recourse they can't be denied, and we think they'll know what to do with it.

Modernization of Federal Salary Systems

SPEECH
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 11, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8986) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am aware of problems confronting our employees. I have in the past supported reasonable wage increases for our employees and helped in legislation on other matters which concern them. I have considered the needs of our employees just as I would if I were a private employer. Indeed, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has the same responsibility on wages and working conditions of Federal employees as does an employer in private industry for his employees.

I again favored wage adjustments for employees of the Government when hearings were held and the bill before us was debated in the committee last year. I do so today. However, I strongly opposed the whopping increases in salary for the legislative branch, including Members of Congress, and the high-ranking members of the executive branch, including Cabinet officers and other officials. I also opposed the big increases for members of the judiciary.

I consistently supported the proposition that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service should debate and approve salary legislation for Post Office and rank-and-file classified employees. That is the responsibility of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. But the salary increases for the members of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government do not rightly belong in this bill. The salary legislation affecting these latter three groups should properly go to the Committees on House Administration and Judiciary, just as they have in the past. Even so, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I can see no justification for the whopping increases proposed in this bill for the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. I so stated in my minority views which are before you as a part of the committee report.

We have just passed a huge tax reduction bill and many nice speeches were made by the supporters of that bill that we should now economize. But the ink is hardly dry on that measure when now we have before us this huge increase in salaries for ourselves, the high-ranking members of the executive branch and the judiciary. This proposal certainly does not set a good example of our intention to reduce spending.

After the general debate is concluded, Mr. Chairman, I shall offer amendments to the pending bill to eliminate the salary increases for officials of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. If my efforts to divorce these from title I, which has to do with the postal and rank-and-file classified workers, fail, then I shall have to vote against the entire bill.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated in my minority views which were written by me last fall, I do not argue with any Member as to whether he thinks his pay should be increased by 45 percent or if he believes similar increases should be given to the high-ranking officials of the executive branch and the Federal judiciary. I do, however, in all sincerity, call upon each Member to stand up in support of a rollcall on final passage in order that the public will know just where each Member stands.

I voted for the rule to bring this measure before us. I felt dutybound to do so because the bill came from my committee. But it should be understood that I did so because I felt certain the rule would be adopted and I could then offer the amendments to separate the postal and rank-and-file wage section of the bill from the excessive increases proposed for Members of Congress, Cabinet officers, and members of the judiciary.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the winner of Oklahoma's State essay contest sponsored by the Governor's committee on employment of the handicapped is Miss Carol Greenwood, a resident of my district in Lawton, Okla. She is a student at Lawton High School and her essay reflects much thought on hiring the handicapped. I would like to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

Rat-a-tat-tat. Rat-a-tat-tat. The sound of a drum is inspiring. It has stimulated men to battle, rousing their spirits as they march. Rat-a-tat-tat. The drummer, playing his insistent rolls, has kept them in step as they tramp to their destiny. Even today there are drummers, but they do not play loudly nor in public. Each man must listen to his own and march accordingly. The handicapped march to a drummer that whole men can never hear. According to Thoreau, "If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away."[1]

"Let him step to the music which he hears." You are in a chair on the righthand side of a crowded auditorium in a growing town. It is 1952, an election year. On the stage sit several men, all political candidates. A man with twinkling eyes and a good-natured smile stands. As he strides toward the microphone, a few people notice his slight limp. The woman sitting beside you asks about his leg. Engrossed in the words and ideas of this pleasant, capable man, you do not answer. Faintly, far back in your mind, you hear the rat-a-tat-tat of a drum.

The man who stood before you first heard that drum during World War II. He heard it at the same moment a land mine destroyed half of his leg. The drum, faint at first, gradually gained volume. With an artificial limb this man relearned to march, this time to a new drumbeat. He learned well and in 1952 became the new mayor. Later he held the position of area contact representative for the Veterans' Administration. He proved that a land mine could not prevent a man with ability from keeping step with his drummer.

Up and down the piano keys run the aging fingers. Up and down the piano keys mimic the smaller ones, eagerly groping for perfection. In the background is the faint, sweet whisper of a drum. The older fingers belong to a middle-aged piano teacher who is confined to a wheel chair. Her ability as a teacher is not affected by the polio in her legs. She may never consciously pay attention to the drum, but unknowingly, she hears and heeds.

A horse neighed, car brakes squealed, a boy screamed, and somewhere far away a drum began to beat. This was the way one young man of 15 learned to march a new way. A car struck the horse he was riding, cutting his leg off just below the hip. What an enormous blow the accident was to a young boy, a blow that could have handicapped much more than his body; however, he heard the drum. Once outfitted with an artificial limb, he, too, stepped to its music; he ran to its music; he won the City Tennis Tournament to its music. Ability, a tennis racquet, and a drum made an unbeatable combination.

More than 4 million handicapped persons have fallen into step with this drum during the last 15 years.[2] These have enlisted through State employment agencies, while untold numbers have joined the growing ranks of handicapped workers on their own. They have convinced nationwide firms and small businesses alike that their ability counts, but there are thousands more still awaiting an opportunity to follow the drummer.

Each person mentioned here accomplished what he set out to do, despite obvious hardships. Perhaps this accomplishment was easier for the woman because her ability and disability were so disconnected. For the men, keeping step down their chosen paths was extremely difficult. Yet the three of them had one thing in common: each heard that special drummer, and each stepped to his music. In the words of Ella Wheeler Wilcox: "When a soul burns with a godlike purpose to achieve, all obstacles between it and its goal must vanish as the dew before the sun."[3]

What is this "God-like purpose to achieve" but the sound of a drummer, a drummer who plays for all the handicapped, a drummer whose message is courage, strength and faith? Look around you. Innumerable handicapped workers are proving that their ability counts, and each one is marching to the staccato beat of a faraway drum.

[1] Henry David Thoreau, "Adventures in American Literature," New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963, p. 583.

[2] "Fifteen Years," U.S. Government pamphlet.

[3] Ella Wheeler Wilcox, "My Book of Golden Thoughts," Racine, Wis.; Whitman Publishing Co., 1931, p. 61.

Flag Rates Respect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David R. Johnson, principal of Hillsboro High School, Hillsboro, Ind., has written a very moving and eloquent letter to the editor of the Indianapolis Star.

Principal Johnson praises the respect that his student body has shown for the national anthem and the flag of the United States. I believe the pupils of Hillsboro have set an example that could be followed by students of all our high schools and colleges. Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert this fine letter to the editor in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FLAG RATES RESPECT

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

In the last year I have had the opportunity to observe many students, teachers and parents at ball games when the national anthem was played.

It is a disgrace to think the American people would eat popcorn, hotdogs, laugh, kiss, talk, chew gum, stand with their hands in their pockets and worst of all not even remove their hats, while the national anthem is played. We are failing our future generations and losing our freedom by our own examples. It only takes a few minutes of our time to learn, show and teach proper respect for our American flag.

Recently I was so proud of the students and basketball team of Hillsboro High School that I almost burst with pride. They all stood at attention with their right hand over their heart, showing complete respect for our flag. Let me tell you—as I looked at our flag. I could almost swear I saw a million smiling faces asking themselves, "We deserve this kind of respect, why can't every American do this for us" I ask myself, why can't every American do this? After all it is so little for so much.

DAVID R. JOHNSON,
Principal, Hillsboro Public Schools,
HILLSBORO, IND.

Whitewash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Thursday, March 12, 1964:

WHITEWASH

Those who have been trying to identify that unpleasant odor floating around the Senate side of the Capitol need go no further. It's whitewash.

There is every indication that the Senate Rules Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator JORDAN, of North Carolina, is preparing to give up the ghost in its "investigation" of the Bobby Baker scandal. Apparently the committee, or the controlling members of the committee, have had enough. They don't want to develop the whole truth for the edification of the public.

The excuse offered is that there are no other useful witnesses who might be called. This is nonsense.

What about Senators? What about party girls? What about unexplored statements regarding campaign funds? What about Jay McDonnell, who was fired as assistant to Bobby Baker because he didn't agree with all aspects of the Baker method of operation? What about a lobbyist named I. Irving Davidson, who might have some important testimony to give?

Most important of all, what about Walter Jenkins, longtime aid to Lyndon B. Johnson?

Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, has just given the committee an affidavit from Don F. Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, which raises grave questions respecting Mr. Jenkins. Shouldn't these be explored, at least to the extent of trying to pin down the truth?

And what about the deal in which Mr. Reynolds said he bought $1,280 worth of useless advertising time on the Johnson television station in Texas after he had sold a $100,000 life insurance policy to Mr. Johnson? Mr. Reynolds has testified under oath that he discussed this advertising project with Mr. Jenkins. Mr. Jenkins has never been called to testify. But he has denied in a sworn statement that he had any knowledge of the arrangements between Mr. Reynolds and the station.

Is this not important? Mr. Jenkins was a Senate employee at the time. Why has he not at least been called as a witness and cross-examined in an effort to clear up this apparent discrepancy? Mr. Reynolds undoubtedly paid for the time. Somebody

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

in regional and field organizations. The launching of the comprehensive program coincides with the shift in emphasis in the reserve program and the two must obviously complement one another.

Task forces organized under the comprehensive program involve as many reservists as possible. This helps the task force to avoid mistakes which the trained reservist can more readily detect. In addition, it encourages complete compatibility with Federal agency programs. The reservist with a Federal assignment is likely to be more familiar with national problems and objectives and, therefore, can contribute valuable background and experience to task force planning.

But the advantage works both ways. As reservists become members of State and local task forces they are assured of the most timely information in the emergency planning field and the training received through their Federal agency assignment is thereby enhanced.

So as you can see, the executive reserve, with a present enrollment of about 3,100 top drawer leaders, in 14 regions of the country, figures prominently in the total emergency planning effort. We need rapidly to expand the size of most units of the NDER. It is not now strong enough. Growth in all areas is anticipated as 31 Federal departments and agencies move to respond to a mandate issued 2 years ago—specific Presidential Executive orders spelling out the emergency planning responsibility of each segment of the Federal Government as an extension of their peacetime roles.

Let me cite some examples of how we hope this total expansion will be achieved.

The Department of Agriculture is now establishing a reserve unit with an expected strength of 300 members recruited from a wide range of industries including food, fertilizer, pesticide, farm equipment, processing and other food-connected activities.

The Office of Emergency Transportation has organized a unit with an authorized strength of 300 to staff its transportation mission at national, regional, and State levels.

Other departments and agencies with comparable expansion timetables include the Department of Labor, Interior, and Commerce (including BDSA and the Maritime Administration) and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

None of us will ever forget the last national conference of the National Defense Executive Reserve, in Washington, D.C. It is particularly clear to me since I directed that conference. All, however, remember that date, October 22, 1962, because it was that evening that President Kennedy announced the quarantine of Cuba that was required by the introduction of Soviet offensive measures. I know we all remember the tensions of the succeeding week until it became clear that peace would be maintained. Perhaps more than ever before, the Cuban crisis brought home to executive reservists and to all of the American people that nuclear warfare, however unlikely, remains a possibility which we must be prepared to meet.

Another national conference is tentatively scheduled for 1965 in Washington. I venture an educated guess that the fruits of this expansion will be quite evident at that time. With respect to that conference, we have duly noted your comments and suggestions regarding the shortcomings of previous national Executive Reserve conferences. We recognize that reservists must be permitted more time for the hard but productive work of hammering out concrete assignments within parent agencies. We intend to assure that ample time is set aside for these endeavors at the next national conference for, in reality, these are the nuts and bolts of reserve duty if membership is to mean something more than the possession of a certificate.

Finally, let me stress that membership in the reserve is something more than recognition of your individual talents and skills. Those who serve the total mission of mobilization preparedness have put themselves in the front lines of the epic struggle for freedom. Your work is no less urgent because a limited nuclear test ban treaty has been signed.

As encouraging as this first step is, in the long journey toward disarmament, it alone gives no cause for relaxation. On the contrary, it is only because we are prepared militarily, economically, and socially for the worst that we can take these steps toward the best—a peaceful world with a chance of freedom for all.

This work of the executive reserve, in emergency planning, then, is for a great goal—the freedom and safety of our country, our neighbors, our children.

Second Thoughts on the Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent to me, as I am sure it is to most of my colleagues, that the House is having some second thoughts following last week's defeat of Federal salary legislation. I would hesitate to predict the outcome of these second thoughts, but I know there are many Members who would like to see further action of some sort on the pressing problems which prompted this legislation in the first instance.

Over the weekend a number of newspapers took the House to task for its failure to pass the pay bill. One of these was the New York Times, which carried an editorial in its edition of Sunday, March 15. On the same page was a column by James Reston giving his views on the need for increases in the pay of top-ranking Federal executives. Both the editorial and the column deserve the attention and sober reflection of all of us in the Congress.

Without objection I insert the editorial and column at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

INCREASING FEDERAL PAY

A shortsighted and small-minded coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats has voted down a salary-increase bill in the House of Representatives, but this decision should not be permitted to stand. The bill can and should be revived through action initiated either in the House or Senate.

The measure which deserves this second chance would raise by an average of about 5 percent the pay of a million and a half white-collar classified employees and postal workers. It would increase by somewhat more than this the pay of Cabinet members and of other top-level Federal officials, and of all Federal judges. It would lift the salaries of Members of Congress from $22,500 to $32,500. The annual cost of the whole plan would be $545 million. It would be worth it.

It would be worth it because it is good economy to pay salaries high enough to attract topnotch men and women into Federal office and to keep them there in the face of increased competition for their services. One of the most familiar, and discouraging, stories in Washington is the loss by one Federal agency after another of public servants who are doing an excellent job, who like their work and want to go on with it, but who feel compelled to turn elsewhere for a better income.

It is perfectly conceivable that there will be an exodus from Washington of high-quality officials who cannot afford to stay unless a bill of this kind is passed. They should not be asked to make the financial sacrifice they are making—and this comment applies particularly to those in the upper levels of Government.

In the case of Members of Congress, there is a particularly strong argument for higher salaries. This is the desirability of freeing Congressmen from the need or the temptation of supplementing their Federal pay by outside work which may easily involve a conflict of interest with their legislative work. A genuinely hard-working Congressman, ready and equipped to face intelligently and conscientiously each piece of public business as it arises, is worth every bit of $32,500.

No petty political considerations should be allowed to block reconsideration of this bill.

JOHNSON'S MONEY PROBLEMS AND OTHER THINGS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 14.—One of the persistently awkward things about the people who work for the Government in Washington is that they like to eat and have children and be paid for their hire like other members of the human race.

This has created a problem for every President since General Washington, and Lyndon Johnson is no exception. His appointments so far have been good, but he has lost several brilliant men from the old Kennedy team, including Ted Sorensen, Kenneth Galbraith, Jerome Wiesner, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and the Congress has added to the brain drain by refusing to pass the administration's pay-rise bill.

Some of this drift of talent was inevitable and some of it was desirable. There is always an evacuation in every election year, and President Johnson should and will have his own men if he wins in November. But holding or recruiting talented and experienced men who are tough enough to stand up to Lyndon Johnson 18 hours a day, 7 days in the week has been made all the more difficult by freezing wages even below academic, let alone industrial or commercial levels.

PROBLEM OF PRIORITIES

Part of the difficulty is that Congress has refused to raise the pay of one group of public servants unless it can raise them all. It draws no distinction between a secretary who wrestles with letters and an Under Secretary who wrestles with De Gaulle. In short, it has ignored the fact that there are too many drones at the bottom of the Government and too few brains at the top.

Also, the Congress, not unnaturally, feels that if the executives in the Government get more money, Congressmen, who also pay rent and have children, should get more too, and this would bring the across-the-board pay hike to $545 million a year, which is more than some Congressmen think the voters would be in a mood to approve after the Bobby Baker case in an election year.

So long as Congress refuses to distinguish between a postman and a scientist and between the shortage of brains and the surplus of bodies in Washington, the problem is insoluble, but there is a way to reconcile sanity with solvency.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

This is to pay more for brains at the top, and lop off more bodies at the bottom. This would improve the Government at both ends, probably without the expenditure of much more money, and it has the added advantage of fitting neatly into the Johnsonian ideal of an administration that is a generous tightwad.

It can be argued, of course, though Senator BYRD would not agree, that comparatively the Federal payroll is not inflated. In the last 10 years, while the population of the country has gone up 17 percent, and non-Government employment has gone up over 10 percent, the State and municipal employees have increased by 65 percent and the Federal civil employees have gone up only 6 percent.

Thus, with the help of automation for processing checks and bonds and income taxes, among other things, there are now 13 Federal employees for every thousand Americans, whereas there were 14 a decade ago.

Nevertheless, there is scarcely an observer in or out of the Government here who would not argue that the Government is overstaffed and could be improved by judicious, or even a little injudicious, pruning.

One of these days the automobiles of the Federal employees are going to get into such a jam that the Government will simply stop and somebody will have to pave over the cars in the Federal triangle and start all over again.

If all the friends of friends who occupy Federal jobs as status symbols in the outer rooms of assistants to the deputy assistants to the directors of subbureaus in the country sections of large agencies or departments—all of them—were fired on Monday, the Government would probably purr with efficiency and enough money would be saved to pay really competent and essential people twice what they could command anywhere else.

FRIVOLITY ASIDE

The payroll for the people who really know enough to tell the great men what to do is really not very much. Though the total payroll increase for everybody amounted to $545 million a year, the proposed pay rise for the really critical executive payroll—from assistant secretaries up through bureau heads and the Cabinet—amounted to only $4.2 million. And this much could probably be saved by lopping off half the chauffeurs and making some of the bigshots ride to the office on the bus.

This is not a totally frivolous suggestion. No government is any better than its top policy advisers, and no administration needs them more than this one. It is brilliant at getting things through the Congress—probably much better at it than the Kennedy administration—but it is not so clear about what it wants to get through, and this is the job of many of the men who are now quietly negotiating their way into higher paying jobs in foundations, universities, research centers, magazines, and industries next autumn.

Invocations by Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 19, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on February 24, 1964, Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch delivered the invocation for the annual banquet of the National Housing Conference. Rabbi Hirsch also delivered the invocation for the banquet in 1963.

In his brief comments, Rabbi Hirsch has been able to relate religious values to the subject of housing. These invocations are eloquent in their brevity and simplicity, and I ask unanimous consent that the invocations delivered by Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the invocations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVOCATION BY RABBI RICHARD G. HIRSCH AT THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 24, 1964

O Lord, creator of all, as we view the communities which are the work of our hands, we still hear the echo of the angry denunciation of Thy prophet of old:

"Woe to him who gaineth evil gains for his house, to set his nest on high, to be safe from the reach of harm. Thou has devised shame to thy house by cutting off many peoples." (Habbakuk 2: 9, 10.)

Oh Lord, may our society never build nests so high that we cannot see the evil consequences of our gains:

The callous cutting off of many peoples from the proper living environment conducive to fulfillment of their potentialities;

The blind obeisance to the fickle idol of economic theories which tend to favor the housing needs of the "haves" over those of the "have-nots."

The searing shame of perpetuating segregation by race and class.

Praised be Thou, O Lord, our God, for the nourishment on our tables, and for the sense of justice in our souls which does not permit us to be at ease until all men receive in adequate measure the material blessings which Thou hast intended for all created in Thine image. Amen.

INVOCATION BY RABBI RICHARD G. HIRSCH AT THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 25, 1963, WASHINGTON, D.C.

O Master of the Universe, Thou who hast created man to be a steward of all Thy possessions, even as it is written in Scriptures:

"The land is mine (sayeth the Lord) for ye are strangers and settlers with Me, and in all the land of your possession shall ye grant a redemption for the land."

Even as we begin the process of redemption and renewal for our land, we are obstructed by those who have forgotten that the land and all that is thereon is Thine, and that our civilization is a monument, not to rugged individualism, but to responsible individuals, to the accumulated rewards of generations of collective effort by countless human beings.

We are perverted by our own passion for self-indulgence which has produced cities without citizens, communities without communicants, and neighborhoods without neighbors. We substitute idolatrous devotion to manmade theories of supply and demand for divine commandments to devote the earth's abundant supply to the demands and needs of our fellow men.

Give us the insight, O Lord, to know that man's spiritual needs cannot be isolated from his physical needs, that the real blight of our time is not the slum but the society which tolerates the slum, not the unemployed but the society which passively accepts human stultification, not the inadequate provisions for the elderly, but the inadequate vision which fails to see that "they shall still bring forth fruit in old age" (Psalms 92: 15), not the substandard housing, but the substandard society which stops short of guaranteeing dignity to every human being.

Instill in us, O Lord, the will to fulfill the words of the Psalmist:

"Except the Lord keep the city,
The watchman waketh but in vain;
Except the Lord build the house
They labor in vain that build it."
(Psalms 127: 1.)

Congress Should Act Promptly on President's Poverty Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 11, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's proposed plan to provide a Job Corps to put 100,000 idle youths to work in more than 100 camps around the country is meeting with widespread acceptance and approval. Prompt action on this proposal and the President's war on poverty program has been endorsed and urged in many areas by the press and the public.

The Nashville Tennessean, a great news journal of my State, in an editorial of March 17, 1964, has called for prompt action on this program, and under unanimous consent I include this editorial at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT SOON ON POVERTY PLAN

President Johnson has submitted to Congress his program for reducing poverty in the Nation. The plan submitted is no halfway measure. It calls for a massive attack on the causes of poverty rather than merely on the symptoms.

The President set the pace for this type of effort when he asked Congress for the weapons with which to win a "total victory" in the war against poverty.

Mr. Johnson asked for approval of a "Job Corps" eventually to put 100,000 youths to work in more than 100 camps around the country. About half of these would work in special conservation projects to give them work experience. The other 50 percent would get training, basic education and work assignments in the training centers.

Under the whole program, almost 500,000 underprivileged youth would get a chance to develop skills, continue education, and find useful work.

One of the most attractive features of the plan is the opportunity for each American community to develop an antipoverty plan to meet its own problems and receive Federal aid to carry it out.

The Government would also help pay the cost of providing jobs in such places as playgrounds, libraries and settlement houses to youths between 16 and 21 out of school and out of work. Another fund would provide part-time jobs for students having to work their way through college.

Special phases of the program would assist poverty-stricken farm families, provide loans for small businesses to provide more jobs for low income workers, and help unemployed fathers of needy families to become self-supporting.

The program, which would be carried out by a special Office of Economic Opportunity, in coordination with other government departments, obviously is the result of a great deal of planning and research into the poverty pockets of the Nation.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

peace of the world and the prevention of Communist revolutionary of all of Latin America and the West Indies are at stake and must be accepted as factors in the Panama Canal equation.

The text of the indicated statement of President Johnson follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 17, 1964]

REMARKS BY JOHNSON ON PANAMA SITUATION

(The White House transcript of President Johnson's remarks on Panama, during his Alliance for Progress speech)

Let me now depart for a moment from my main theme to speak of the differences that have developed between Panama and the United States.

Our own position is clear and it has been from the first hour that we learned of the disturbances. The United States will meet with Panama anytime, anywhere, to discuss anything, to work together to cooperate with each other, to reason with one another, to review and to consider all of our problems together, to tell each other all our opinions, all our desires, and all our concerns, and to aim at solutions and answers that are fair and just and equitable without regard to the size or the strength or the wealth of either nation.

We don't ask Panama to make any precommitments before we meet, and we intend to make none. Of course, we cannot begin on this work until diplomatic relations are resumed, but the United States is ready today, if Panama is ready. As of this moment, I do not believe that there has been a genuine meeting of the minds between the two Presidents of the two countries involved.

Press reports indicate that the Government of Panama feels that the language which has been under consideration for many days commits the United States to a rewriting and to a revision of the 1903 treaty. We have made no such commitment and we would not think of doing so before diplomatic relations are resumed and unless a fair and satisfactory adjustment is agreed upon.

We have no apologies to make to Panama and no restitution is called for. We have fulfilled our obligations honorably and generously. Our association with Panama over the years has been mutually beneficial and generally beneficial to the entire world.

It is important for everyone to know that we have paid our way in Panama. While some find it distasteful to point to mundane money matters, it is a cold cruel world we live in and money matters are highly significant in the affairs of men and nations.

Direct annual payments of $250,000 were paid to Panama for U.S. rights in perpetuity in the 10-mile-wide strip beginning 9 years after ratification of the original treaty of 1903. This amount was paid annually until 1936 when such payments were increased to $430,000 per year, made retroactive to the 1934 payment. In fiscal year 1957 the payment was raised to $1,930,000 of which $430,000 is reimbursed to the U.S. Treasury by the Panama Canal Company. The other $1,500,000 is appropriated annually by Congress.

In 1903 a lump-sum payment of $10 million was given to Panama by the U.S. Government.

Thus, from 1903 through 1963 the United States has made direct payments of over $175 million to Panama for the canal.

Under the terms of the 1955 Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation the United States agreed to transfer to the Government of Panama certain U.S.-owned property outside the Canal Zone, which property was valued at about $24 million. We also agreed to construct a high-level bridge costing $20 million across the canal at Balboa to speed Panamanian traffic. The property transfer involved schools, hospitals, railroad yards, military reservations and extensive residental construction. The Thatcher Ferry Bridge was completed in 1962.

In addition to the direct payments which I have enumerated, millions of U.S. dollars flow out of the Canal Zone and into the mainstream of the Panamanian economy indirectly through U.S. agencies, the Canal Company, contractors, and private organizations such as shipping agents, clubs, churches, oil companies, banks and employee associations.

Salaries of non-U.S. citizens employed in the Canal Zone amounted to $33 million in 1962. Retirement and disability benefits paid by the Canal Company to Panama residents amounted to another $3.5 million.

Direct purchases by U.S. Government agencies in the Republic of Panama totaled $11.8 million in 1962. Purchases of goods in Panama by private organizations in the Canal Zone added another $4.4 million. Contractors' purchases of goods and services reached a value of $10.6 million. And U.S. citizens employed in the Canal Zone spend another $20 million yearly in the Republic of Panama.

Altogether these indirect payments to the Republic of Panama amounted to about $82,465,000 in 1962.

U.S. foreign aid granted to the Government of Panama amounted to $63 million between July 1, 1945, and December 31, 1962.

The World Bank has loaned a total of $18,047,000 for use in agricultural development, electric power, and highway improvement.

Finally, American investments in Panama are substantial. U.S. private investments were estimated at $328 million in 1960, over half of which was in oil tanker and shipping operations. This was estimated to be about half of the total capital invested in Panama; the other half being 48 percent Panamanian and 2 percent other foreign, mainly French.

The Republic of Panama would not have been born except for the U.S. determination to build the canal. We were both mother and midwife, and we nursed the infant nation through childhood to maturity. We have sustained her economically, politically and militarily through all the years of her life.

We have nothing to be ashamed of in our relations with Panama. We have the right and the obligation to continue the treaty of 1903 and our control of the canal.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POSITION ON PANAMA IS FAIR AND SOUND

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with and commend my colleague, Mr. FLOOD, on his remarks. I call attention to and applaud the President's remarks regarding Panama made March 16 in his Alliance for Progress speech. The position of the U.S. Government, laid down by the President, is fair and sound. He said, in summary, "We are ready to talk but we will not make any advance commitments."

The President's statement had the quality of resoluteness that has been lacking following previous Latin incidents. It was this very lack of firmness, combined with excessive toleration of insults and assaults heaped upon us throughout Latin America which, in my opinion, brought on the present Panamanian crisis. Stated bluntly, our actions tended to mislead Panama into thinking she could take over the canal or at least rewrite the treaty of 1903 on her terms. We kept giving on small issues which may have led Panama to believe that we would give on the big ones too.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. FEIGHAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 68 I am recorded as being absent. I was, in fact, present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and the Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL PAY INCREASE

(Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Evening Star it was reported that President Johnson has written to the leadership of the Congress to the effect that he needs the Federal pay increase in order to attract more qualified people in responsible positions in the Government. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the President would be kind enough to name for us the unqualified people that he has been unable to replace because of insufficient pay.

THE CHAFF THAT CHAFES

(Mr. HORTON (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to the sale of U.S. agricultural

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

commodities to the Communist bloc is a matter of record. I have repeatedly opposed these transactions.

Earlier this month, I addressed the House and reaffirmed my belief that the sale of our wheat to Russia is contrary to our national interest. The sale is indefensible on economic grounds since we have granted credit to Khrushchev on these purchases, and, thus, obviated any chance of turning the gold outflow tide. The sale is indefensible for security reasons since wheat can be turned to alcohol, a prime ingredient in munitions and missile fuel. The sale is indefensible for international policy purposes since it makes a mockery of our avowed intention to use peaceful means for the defeat of communism.

Now, I find the sale of wheat to Russia is having an alarming consequence for the thousands of American industries who rely on railroad shipments and deliveries and the millions of men and women employed by those industries. A critical shortage of rail cars for domestic shipping has developed from the diversion of these cars for wheat shipments to coastal ports.

Mr. Speaker, this shortage of rail cars is having a pronounced impact on the 36th Congressional District, which I represent. A fertilizer manufacturer, for example, fears that he will not be able to meet his production schedules because the raw materials essential to his industry are shipped by rail from the mines and chemical companies. Certain weekly newspapers in my district report these shippers have warned their customers that major wheat shipments destined for foreign delivery are tieing up thousands of rail cars.

If the raw materials cannot be shipped because of two few available rail cars, economic havoc will occur for the shipper who loses customers, for the manufacturer who loses customers, for the farmer who loses customers, and for the consumer who will have to pay a higher price for a smaller supply of farm goods. And, we should not forget that at every step in this chain of chaos, there will be men and women whose employment is jeopardized.

Mr. Speaker, the Interstate Commerce Commission—ICC—has indicated its awareness of the present problem. In fact, the ICC reported to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

> Undoubtedly, any upsurge of grain movements stemming from transactions with the Union of Soviet Socialists Republics or any Soviet bloc country would greatly increase the demand for boxcars and obviously aggravate the present and increasingly acute baxcar shortage.

Because of the gravity surrounding this situation, I feel Congress should record itself as favoring priority for the rail transportation requirements of domestic shippers. I believe it should be expressed as the sense of Congress that the ICC not require the use of the rail carriers' equipment and facilities for the movement of grain to be shipped to our Communist foes, unless all other domestice transportation needs have been met.

Mr. Speaker, an appropriate resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 228, has been introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] and now is pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I wish to announce that I enthusiastically endorse this measure and am pledged to its passage.

Further, I want to appeal to the ICC to take immediate steps to assure that sufficient railroad cars are available for the use of domestic shippers. Certainly, this Federal agency has a responsibility to do all it can to prevent the unemployment and lost business which will result if these shipments cannot be made.

The rail car shortage is the "straw that breaks the camel's back"—or, more appropriately, the "chaff that chafes."

FOREIGN TRADE

(Mr. WEAVER (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN), was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, a favorable balance of foreign trade depends upon mutual respect and consideration by each of the countries involved. The problems of increasing imports and decreasing competitive export opportunities has been evident in the steel, meat, and electrical transformer industries.

In the case of the forthcoming GATT conferences, I have submitted to the respective Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Trade Information Committee, a letter which puts forth my views on this basic problem. It is indeed essential because of the industries' importance to the domestic economy that U.S. duties on products of electrical manufacture should be reduced only in consideration of equally favorable foreign concessions on the same products.

The foreign nontariff barriers have an even more restrictive influence on American exports of electrical manufacture than under tariffs. It is, therefore, necessary that the United States make clear in the GATT conferences that it believes that such barriers are inconsistent with the purposes of that conference and that an expert adviser on electrical products be a member of that negotiating team. The following is the text of my letter:

The Honorable BEN DORFMAN,
Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission,
Washington, D.C.
The Honorable W. H. RODD,
Chairman, Trade Information Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MESSRS. DORFMAN AND RODD: A number of large plants manufacturing electrical apparatus are located in the congressional district which I represent. These plants, the employment they provide, the products they make, and the research and development they conduct, are of the greatest importance to the economy of this region of Pennsylvania and of the United States. I have reviewed the economic information they have submitted to the Tariff Commission and to the Trade Information Committee in connection with the forthcoming GATT negotiations. I commend this industry for endorsing the purposes of the Trade Agreements Act of 1962, and I sincerely hope that the Tariff Commission (Trade Information Committee) can accept the recommendations of the American electrical manufacturing industry—namely, that the U.S. negotiators at Geneva insist upon obtaining meaningful, actual opportunity for American electrical manufacturers to sell their products to electric utilities and heavy manufacturing concerns in Europe. European tariff and nontariff barriers and the nationalistic buying practices of the Common Market and other European countries' government-owned or controlled electrical utility systems constitute an unfair discrimination against American electrical manufacturers. I am convinced that unless such barriers are broken down and unless this industry is accorded meaningful opportunity to compete in the European markets on the basis of the performance, quality, and price of their products, it would be the greatest folly to reduce American tariffs on heavy electrical apparatus, since this action would principally benefit European and Japanese electrical manufacturers.

The widespread use of electricity by all segments of our population and in virtually all American factories, at the world's lowest rates, has been a significant factor in giving us the highest standard of living and the highest productivity in the world. The continuing availability of reliable, inexpensive electric service throughout the United States could never have been achieved without the progressive operations and research and development carried on by the American electrical equipment manufacturing industry, and it must remain viable if our country is to maintain its economic progress.

I urge the Tariff Commission (Trade Information Committee) to consider this industry's problems with the greatest sympathetic care and attention.

LIVERMORE FALLS DAM—OPPOSITION ECHOES IN THE WEST

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, throughout the West there is rising opposition to unneeded Federal dam projects which destroy existing economic development and ruin scenic beauty. In New Hampshire we are also being threatened with a Federal dam project that planners propose to foist upon us despite its unsuitability and the opposition of local citizens. The proposed Livermore Dam, which I oppose and concerning which I have spoken the last 2 days—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 16, page 5121; March 17, page 5330—would perhaps ruin the economic and community life of the entire upper Pemigewasset Valley in New Hampshire. By delaying Route 93 it is a threat to the entire north country.

More Americans should join in saying "No" to indiscriminate public works planners and spenders as an increasing number of citizens are now doing. I congratulate the people from the 10 communities in New Hampshire who are fighting to save their area from the unnecessary invasion of the Federal Government.

I commend to my colleagues' attention an article, "Where Money From Washington Is Being Turned Down," from the March 16 issue of U.S. News & World Report which tells about the heartening resistance in the West to the Federal dam builders:

WHERE MONEY FROM WASHINGTON IS BEING TURNED DOWN

(The West, long prone to view Washington as the wellspring of plenty, is taking another look.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 110 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1964 No. 50

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 145: 9: *The Lord is good to all: and His tender mercies are over all His works.*

Almighty God, as we daily meditate upon Thy goodness, may we have a greater faith in the sovereignty of Thy divine love which is redeeming in its purpose and power.

May we be emancipated from all selfish and sordid desires to have the good things of life for our own satisfaction and security instead of sharing them with the poor and needy.

Inspire the soul of humanity to be lifted out of the fret and jar of life into that free and peaceful atmosphere where all shall be striving for justice and righteousness, for truth and love.

Grant that we may be obedient to Thy moral and spiritual laws which are a command and a challenge to our better self, and sending us down upon our knees in reverence and bidding us to rise and go forward, never again to doubt or be afraid.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1759. An act for the relief of Rebecca K. Clayton;

H.R. 2189. An act for the relief of Morris Aronow and other employees of the Post Office Department;

H.R. 2724. An act for the relief of Davey Ellen Snider Siegel;

H.R. 4681. An act for the relief of CWO James A. McQuaig;

H.R. 5584. An act for the relief of Capt. Ransom C. Aplin;

H.R. 6748. An act for the relief of the J. D. Wallace & Co., Inc.;

H.R. 8260. An act for the relief of Mrs. Annette M. Rasor and Dr. Robert W. Rasor;

H.R. 8470. An act for the relief of Warren A. Jeffers and Francis H. Leik; and

H.R. 8930. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 309. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Henry H. Allport, Army of the United States, retired;

S. 353. An act for the relief of Benjamin A. Ramelb;

S. 476. An act for the relief of Zenon Zubieta;

S. 1030. An act for the relief of Sister Aurora Martin Gelado (also known as Sister Nieve); and

S. 1999. An act for the relief of Francisco Navarro-Paz.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NASA OVERSIGHT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on NASA Oversight of the Committee on Science and Astronautics be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY RAISE

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's plug for the pay raise bill rejected by the House last week twists logic as well as arms.

He says that failure to vote the pay raise will "jeopardize increases in military pay which I have recommended to keep Armed Forces pay generally in line with nonmilitary salary."

This line of reasoning leaves me confused.

It seems to say that we must raise the pay of civilian Federal employees so that we can vote a second pay raise for the Armed Forces so that the Armed Forces pay will be kept in line with the pay of the civilian employees which the President wants us to increase.

This is not the only assault on logic contained in the President's remarkable statement.

He indicates we will economize by spending more, that we will get a better class of "managers" by raising the pay of the managers we now have, and relieve Members of Congress of the embarassment of voting a $5 million pay increase for themselves by voting a $540 million pay raise for everyone else.

If this be logic, it must at least be admitted that it carries a high price tag for the taxpayers.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 71]

Bass	Clawson, Del	Dowdy
Blatnik	Colmer	Edwards
Buckley	Curtis	Fallon
Carey	Davis, Tenn.	Finnegan

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Forrester	Karth	Olsen, Mont.
Fulton, Tenn.	Kee	Powell
Gray	Lankford	Rains
Hagan, Ga.	Lloyd	Roberts, Ala.
Halpern	McIntire	Rogers, Tex.
Harvey, Mich.	Macdonald	Rooney, N.Y.
Hemphill	Martin, Calif.	Roosevelt
Hoffman	Martin, Mass.	Roybal
Jarman	Minshall	Schadeberg
Johnson, Pa.	Mosher	Stephens
Jones, Ala.	Murray	Willis
Karsten	O'Brien, Ill.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE CHICAGO DELEGATION

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago delegation under the guidance and inspiration of our beloved TOM O'BRIEN has made a reputation in this House for sympathetic understanding of the problems of our colleagues from other areas and, understanding their problems, always we have cooperated.

Mr. Speaker, I am now speaking for the solid delegation from Chicago. We feel that an injury has been done us by one of the great committees of this House. We are not criticizing the committee. We think that the committee, pressed for time, was too easy in approving a payment of $5 million for the vanity of one stupid general.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the committee will give the Chicago Members ample time during general debate to present our case to the membership of this body, and we ask that our colleagues from the other States listen to our presentation. Then if in good conscience you can vote with us we assure you of our appreciation. Five million dollars is a pretty steep price to pay for the vanity of any individual, even a general who was educated at taxpayers expense and then outgrew the people who footed the bill. Five million dollars is just the starting figure.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Friday, March 20, 1964, to file a report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL reserved all points of order.

REPORT OF ACTIVITY UNDER AUTHORITY OF PUBLIC LAW 875—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 249)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have the honor to send to the Congress a report of activity under authority of Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended, and required by section 8 of such law.

Funds which have been appropriated to accomplish the Federal assistance determined eligible under this authority are specifically appropriated to the President for purposes of disaster relief.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 18, 1964.*

Federal assistance in major peacetime disasters is a coordinated operation under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, as amended. Public Law 875, popularly known as the Federal Disaster Act, gives the President broad powers to supplement the efforts and available resources of States and local governments in carrying out their responsibilities to alleviate suffering and damage resulting from major disasters.

A "major disaster" is any flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm or other catastrophe which in the determination of the President is of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant Federal assistance.

When, in his determination, conditions warrant the declaration of a major disaster, the President is authorized to call upon the services of such elements of the Federal Establishment as may be necessary to provide disaster assistance; to coordinate the disaster activities of Federal agencies; and to direct any Federal agency to perform certain types of service not authorized under such agency's normal authority.

The Federal Disaster Act requires the Governor of a State to certify to the President the need for Federal assistance and provide assurance of the expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the State and local governments in combating the effects of disaster. To insure that the Federal Government does not carry the entire burden of disaster relief, the Governor is required to certify that the total expenditures and obligations for disaster relief, in that disaster and all other disasters during the 12-month period preceding the request for assistance, meet or exceed an amount published in the Federal Register as the minimum for that State.

In accordance with authority granted the President in section 5(b) of Public Law 81–875 to exercise any power or authority conferred on him by the act through such Federal agency as he may designate the President has delegated responsibility for administration of the Federal disaster assistance program to the Office of Emergency Planning. Executive Orders 10427, 10737 and 11051 give the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning the authority to coordinate and direct the activities of Federal agencies in providing Federal disaster assistance to State and local governments and to administer funds for disaster relief made available by congressional appropriation to the President.

During calendar year 1963, 20 major disasters were declared in 17 States, Guam and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under the authority of Public Law 81–875. The President authorized allocations in the amount of $13,625,000 for use in these disasters. In addition, initial and supplemental allocations in the amount of $16,051,000 were made for eight disasters occurring in 1962. A total of $29,676,000 was allocated from the President's disaster fund in 1963. The allocations provided for performing protective work essential for the preservation of life and property, performing emergency health and sanitation measures, clearing debris and wreckage, and making emergency repairs and temporary replacement of essential public facilities of States and local governments damaged or destroyed in such major disasters, including provisions for temporary housing or emergency shelter.

In the spring widespread flooding in the Appalachian area affected Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia. The territory of Guam, which was severely damaged by Typhoon Karen in the fall of 1962, was struck a second time in April 1963. The second storm, Typhoon Olive, also affected the islands of Tinian, Rota and Saipan in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. In both territories, the Office of Emergency Planning has assigned primary responsibility for the emergency repair and temporary replacement of damaged public facilities to the Department of the Navy.

The Federal disaster assistance regulations were amended during the year to improve procedures for the determination and certification of State and local expenditures for disaster relief. The amendment, by requiring that the Governor's certification of expenditures contain a breakdown of such expenditures into specified categories, will assist both the States and the Office of Emergency Planning in evaluating requests for Federal disaster assistance. At the time the regulations were amended, the Office of Emergency Planning also announced a modest upward adjustment for all States in the schedule of minimum State and local expenditures required to qualify for assistance under Public Law 875. Both the procedural change and the revised schedule of minimum expenditures will become effective on July 1, 1964.

Substantial gains were made during 1963 in the development and distribution of educational materials on the disaster program. General information pamphlets outlining the procedures and requirements for Federal disaster assistance were prepared for and distributed to Members of Congress, Governors and local government officials. A procedural manual, the 'OEP Regional Operating Guide—Natural Disaster Program' was prepared for Federal departments and agencies with disaster relief responsibilities; and a "Natural Disaster Manual for State and Local Applicants' was made available to all State and local disaster offices.

There is attached a list showing Presidential declarations of major disasters

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

tion is to the general interest. The State commission ordered Motorola, Inc., to cease subjecting job applicants to its overall ability test on the finding that the test is unfair to "culturally deprived and disadvantaged groups." The test was compiled and copyrighted by Prof. Philip Surrager of the Illinois Institute of Technology in 1949 and, with some revisions, has been in use since then. He defined its objective as "not to exclude Negroes from whites * * * but to help evaluate the trainability of a prospective employee * * * and I know of no way to evaluate that a test in itself is discriminatory toward any group."

THE FIRST INSTANCE

Nevertheless, exercising for the first time an authority over the ability tests an employer may use in screening applicants, a State FEPC examiner ordered Motorola, Inc., not only to disuse Surrager's questionnaire, but to offer a job to a Negro who charged he was denied a job because of his race. The Employers Association of Chicago, representing 1,400 companies in the area, challenged the order. And, in announcing that Motorola, Inc., would appeal the action "all the way to the Supreme Court if necessary," its attorney said:

"The question at hand is whether an employer in Illinois is going to be permitted to set the educational, moral, and aptitude standards for its employees, or whether the State will dictate the standards." If title VII survives the Senate debate, the scope of this "question at hand" will spread from Illinois to the Nation. Meanwhile, the attorneys for Motorola, Inc., have contended that the company cannot depend on a fair hearing of its rebuttal because the hearing officer designated by the commission is a Negro.

The company's finding that the applicant had not passed the Surrager test is complicated, so far as his particular case is concerned, by the announcement of the Illinois FEPC that he passed it on reexamination in its own offices. But, in commenting on the examiner's order, the Chicago Tribune stated the issue in its broad perspective.

The examiner had also ruled that the questions in the test did not take into account "inequalities and differences in environment," thereby favoring the "advantaged groups." This, said the Tribune, "may be reduced to the absurdity that any test acceptable to the FEPC would be one which brought out no distinction whatsoever among competing applicants. How then is an employer to develop any basis for making a choice. So here the doctrine is enunciated that a political appointee is going to dictate to business [its] standards of selection."

PAY INCREASE FOR POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the defeat by the other body of a combined pay raise for postal and civil service employees and Members of Congress will be a sad blow to thousands of civil service and postal employees around the country. They need this extra money and were counting on it but have lost out by an unconscionable attempt to include congressional salary increases in the same bill.

In my judgment, it was a mistake to try to attach a provision to an omnibus Federal pay increase bill to raise the salaries of Members of Congress. That issue should stand or fall by itself. It should not be attached to a meritorious and much needed effort to give an increase to our postal and other civil service employees. At best the provisions contained in H.R. 8986 would have brought salaries of postal and other civil service employees up to a par with those being received by persons in comparable positions in private industry 2 years ago.

Many of our Federal employees hold two jobs now in order to make up this deficit and to better provide for their families. Adequate pay raises will insure not only that their families will be better provided for, but also will give well-deserved recognition for the important duties they perform in the operation of our Government.

It seems to me only equitable and fair that Federal salaries should be brought into line with those paid by private industry, and that those who are really in need and are deserving of an increase should not be prejudiced by the defeat of this measure in the other body, which undoubtedly came about because there was attached to it the inexcusable effort to increase salaries of Members of Congress.

In my opinion before serious consideration is given to raising the salaries of Representatives and Senators service in the Congress must be made a full-time job for both Members and employees. The disclosures in the Rules Committee investigation to date, apart from any question of wrongdoing, make it obvious that this is not now the situation.

Conflict of interest legislation applicable to Members and employees must be approved and archaic and unfair rules and procedures of Congress must be completely revised. Then, we will be in a better position to ask the American people for a raise and that request should stand or fall on its own merits.

I believe that there are votes in both the Senate and the other body to enact a bill which would provide an increase for post office and civil service employees now and that the votes are not here and should not be here or in the other body at this time to give a raise to Members of Congress.

It is my hope that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the appropriate committee in the Senate, will give early thought and attention to the favorable report of a bill to give a much deserved pay increase to our postal and other civil service employees.

WALTER F. WILLCOX—A FIGHTER FOR APPORTIONMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, behind the decisionmaking process of Government lie many unsung heroes, one of whom is Prof. Walter F. Willcox, of Ithaca, N.Y., a longtime professor at Cornell University, whose firm dedication to obtaining scientifically apportioned and equitable representation in the House of Representatives culminated in the recent Supreme Court decision.

For many years, Professor Willcox has campaigned for this too often ignored, if not forgotten, provision of the Constitution.

On a number of occasions I have had the privilege of talking with Professor Willcox and enjoyed the opportunity to hear his views.

Professor Willcox is a distinguished, able, and alert man who, I am proud to say, this month with celebrate his 103d birthday. He is a remarkable man. His determined efforts to insure that one man's vote equals another's were in no small part responsible for the recent Supreme Court decision, which goes to the very roots of our system of representative government.

I take this opportunity to congratulate Professor Willcox, and to wish him health, happiness, and success in the future. As a fighter for equal representation, he deserves the gratitude of every American.

HIGH-SPEED PHOTOCOMPOSITION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Printing, of which I am chairman, has this week authorized the Public Printer and the Department of the Air Force to acquire high-speed electronic conversion units for use in connection with the output of automatic data processing equipment.

The increasing volume of copy which is being generated by automatic data processing equipment is generally unsatisfactory for printing without being converted. Wastage of paper, unnecessary printing and binding costs, and poor typographical quality result when such copy is used for printing unless it is converted to a more suitable form by typesetting or other means.

The unit approved for the Air Force is planned for installation at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, near Dayton, to contribute much to the responsive needs of the Air Force for stock lists and other publications. The unit approved for acquisition by the Public Printer will enable the Government Printing Office in Washington to convert data which it receives from numerous departments and agencies into a satisfactory format for printing.

For purposes of explanation, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, the statement of the Joint Committee on Printing which was issued at its meeting of March 10, 1964.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Joint Committee on Printing today announced its approval of two requests for authority to purchase high-speed photocomposing systems to augment the composition facilities of the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., and Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio. The cost of both installations is expected to be amortized through savings in less than 1½ years.

The authorization action is a significant milestone in a program which began on April 10, 1962, when the Joint Committee on Printing requested the Public Printer to institute a research and development program designed to overcome constantly growing waste stemming from material produced by high-speed printers on automatic data processing equipment.

Pursuant to that request, the Public Printer created the position of Electronic Printing Research Officer and, subsequently, the GPO-Departmental Electronic Printing Committee was formed.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

The basic conclusions of that committee confirmed the original view of the Joint Committee on Printing that computer generated copy results in excessive wastage in paper, presswork, and binding operations, as well as poor typographic quality.

Six contractors responded to a Government Printing Office request for a proposal for a high-speed photocomposer and, following careful evaluation, it was determined that only the Mergenthaler Linotype Co. was fully responsive to all the terms of the request.

The Government Printing Office system calls for the capability to produce high quality, automatically justified text matter. The Air Force system will include not only that, but also graphical matter such as line and half-tone illustrations with proper position correlation between the two kinds of material. Both systems will be basically compatible.

A photocomposing speed of 600 characters per second is achieved by the use of a single linotron—the off-line, magnetic-tape, high-speed photocomposer developed by Mergenthaler Linotype Co. working in cooperation with CBS Laboratories. This high-speed composition will be delivered in the form of negatives of graphic arts quality suitable for use in the production printing of publications required by the Federal Government.

The Government Printing Office installation is expected to become operational within approximately 2 years and the Air Force installation within approximately 3 years. The pioneer work which demonstrated the practicability of the system resulted from a contract initiated by the Air Force during 1962.

OUR ONCE PROUD BROTHER: THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate and excellent sermon delivered by the Reverend Robert Zoerheide at Cedar Lane Unitarian Church on Sunday, March 8, 1964.

The sermon, entitled "Our Once Proud Brother: The American Indian," eloquently focuses our attention on the plight of the Seneca Indians who will lose their homes and reservation lands as the Kinzua Dam nears completion.

Reverend Zoerheide's sermon deserves great praise, and I solemnly hope that all those who are concerned with the problems of a much abused minority in our great Nation, the American Indian, will read this sermon.

I ask unanimous consent that the sermon be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR ONCE PROUD BROTHER: THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Bill H.R. 1794 now before Congress seeks to provide $19 million from our taxes for compensation, and to aid the social and economic development of the Seneca Indians who will lose their homes and reservation lands as the Kinzua Dam nears completion.

In 1794, a year coincident to the number of this bill, we made a treaty with the Seneca Nation which read: "The United States will never claim (your lands), nor disturb the Seneca Nation, nor any of the six nations, or of their Indian friends residing thereon and united with them, in the free use and enjoyment threof: but it shall remain theirs, until they chose to sell the same to the people of the United States, who have the right to purchase."

The railroads displaced have already been paid. The Pennsylvania received over $20 million 3 years ago for a few miles of right-of-way. As 1964 began, not a Federal dime has been received for the relocation of Seneca Indian families.

History returns upon us in this hour.

John Collier, former U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and one of our most reliable authorities, wrote a book called "Indians of America, the Long Hope." The first sentence of that book is electric with meaning: "They had what the world has lost." The author goes on to identify this lost ingredient: "the deep cause of our world agony is that we have lost that passion and reverence for human personality and for the web of life and the earth which the American Indians have tended as a central sacred fire since before the stone age. It is our only long hope."

Compare this with the "Tomahawk" ads for TV and movies! We have a curious way of portraying those things as savage which we do not understand. The long tragic history of suffering, by American Indians, as a minority group, is well known but relegated to small print and back pages because they have been considered to be politically unimportant.

A recent annual report of the Unitarian Service Committee gives an account of our off-reservation Navajo community center at Wingate Village, near Gallup, N. Mex., and points out that these displaced persons, within our own land, have the most rapidly growing population in the world in spite of shockingly high infant mortality.

When we do think of our misdeeds against the Indians we tend to review the see-saw of mutual guilt and bloodshed, the destruction of life and of property on both sides. The case for conscience is far more serious. When we came to these lands and cleared them of so-called Indian savages, we committed a usual social crime—all too common in those less enlightened years, but only now are we beginning to see what it was we really did destroy, and still do in the instance of the Senecas.

Centuries of culture among the American Indians had developed human relations so highly that Collier's studies have led him to say: "I think no institutional achievement of mankind exceeds it in either wisdom or intelligence—accepting the limits of its time and place." Collier was speaking of the Iroquois Confederacy of five tribes (later six) formed near the home of the Senecas, who were proud and independent members. Along with the others of the area, they agreed to a plan for peace on the condition that it include all six nations. This was taking place here long before Plymouth was settled.

Will Rogers enjoyed reminding the proud descendants of the Mayflower company that his ancestors met the Pilgrims on the shore. His ancestors were not in flight from their culture.

The Iroquois Confederacy became a reality about the middle of the 16th century through the remarkable strength and wisdom of Deganawida. It was his idea to make the Onondagas, who were nearest to the center, the firekeepers in the proposed league. While each tribe cast a unit vote through its chief in the council, the chief of the Onondagas was the head of the council, the firekeeper or chairman. In a unanimous decision by the others, he simply confirmed the matter—in good group-dynamics fashion—and decisions not unanimous were discussed by the firekeeper in order to discover common ground, or, some new solution. The matter was then remanded to the voting units. This procedure made of legislative process a path to discovery rather than deadlock. The Security Council should take note.

In the "History of the New York Iroquois," the definitive work on the subject, Beauchamp says: "One feature should not be overlooked: the rank and great influences of women * * * the chief women had the power of naming principal chiefs for their family or clan. Speeches are made in the council for them but not by them, and Red Jacket was long their speaker. The most curious testimony to the high estimation of women is the old Huron and Iroquois rule, that for a woman's life the atonement should be double that of a man."

When the serious matter of choosing a Sachem (or wise man) to represent the people came up, there was employed one of the finest guides to judgment ever set forth by a community. The man was chosen "in whose presence it was easiest to arrive at the truth." Combine this insight with those formulated about the method for arriving at a group decision and there is evident an improvement on the essence of what we are boldly calling the new approach of group dynamics.

These American Indians, on this very soil, fashioned a social system for peace that lasted for over 200 years; they developed a system of greatness in human relationships, one that encouraged individual excellence; they grew a personal and social web relating man to nature; and, in contrast to our slaughterhouse methods, they revered the very animals they killed for their food; they not only granted their women rights, they also recognized their ability for greatness. This kinship with nature, workable plan for peace, utility of group strength, and reverence for the human personality, may well "stand today as the most brilliant creation in the record of man," according to historian Beauchamp.

Then came the so-called civilized white man.

The tragedy that followed was not nearly so much the loss of life, as it was the total destruction of one of the most valuable ways of life the world had produced. Where today can you find an example of similar kinship with nature and fineness of social development?

Our soil is crop to can, or, waste in storage. But for the Indian, the corn he eats is loved as a member of a family: He sings what he feels:

"Yellow butterflies,
Over the blossoming virgin corn,
With pollen-painted faces
Chase one another in brilliant throng.

"Blue butterflies,
Over the blossoming virgin beans,
With pollen-painted faces
Chase one another in brilliant streams."

We tore the Indian from his lands; thus we tore the delicate fabric of his soul. Time and time again forced treaties were made to remove the Indians for a small payment in cash. On April 23, 1838, Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote a letter to President Van Buren, in which he warned the Chief Executive that if he approved the removal of the Cherokee Indians from Georgia the name of this Nation, he said, "hitherto the sweet omen of religion and liberty, will stink to the world." Will we have an Emerson in April of 1964, with the Senecas?

Out of 18,000 souls composing the Cherokee Nation, 15,668 protested the so-called treaty to deprive them of their lands. They were nonetheless moved in forced migration. Unitarian Henry Thoreau joined Emerson at a protest meeting in Concord. Neither man liked mass protests, but this outrage really brought forth Walden secluded Thoreau, who was once described by Oliver Wendell Holmes as "half college graduate and half Algonquin."

But the President signed the measure and the Cherokees were herded along a desperate

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

For these reasons I am convinced of the need for speedier justice and the maintenance of orderly processes of law which this legislation would provide. I would add that the fight for this legislation was begun 11 years ago, and the need for it it is even greater today. In addition to myself, Congressman JAMES B. UTT has worked diligently for the success of this legislation.

Special commendation is due Sherwood Roberts and the San Diego Bar Association for their long and dedicated interest and to Representative PAT MINOR MARTIN, whose position on the Judiciary Committee has greatly improved the chances of passage this year.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9567

A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 84 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 84. California

"California is divided into four judicial districts to be known as the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

"NORTHERN DISTRICT

"(a) The Northern District comprises three divisions.

"(1) The Northern Division comprises the counties of Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Marin, Mendocino, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Sonoma.

"Court for the Northern Division shall be held at San Francisco and Eureka.

"(2) The Eastern Division comprises the counties of Alameda, and Contra Costa.

"Court for the Eastern Division shall be held at Oakland.

"(3) The Southern Division comprises the counties of Monterey, San Benito, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz.

"Court for the Southern Division shall be held at San Jose.

"EASTERN DISTRICT

"(b) The Eastern District comprises three divisions.

"(1) The Northern Division comprises the counties of Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity.

"Court for the Northern Division shall be held at Redding.

"(2) The Central Division comprises the counties of Apline, Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, El Dorado, Glenn, Inyo, Mono, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Sierra, Solano, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tuolumne, all of Yosemite National Park, Yolo, and Yuba.

"Court for the Central Division shall be held at Sacramento.

"(3) The Southern Division comprises the counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera except Yosemite National Park, Mariposa except Yosemite National Park, Merced, and Tulare.

"Court for the Southern Division shall be held at Fresno.

"CENTRAL DISTRICT

"(c) The Central District comprises the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura.

"Court for the Central District shall be held at Los Angeles.

"SOUTHERN DISTRICT

"(d) The Southern District comprises the counties of Imperial and San Diego.

"Court for the Southern District shall be held at San Diego."

SEC. 2. (a) The two district judges for the Nortern District of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section and whose official station is Sacramento shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judges for the Eastern District of California whose official station shall be Sacramento. All other district judges for the Northern District of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judges for the Northern District of California.

(b) The district judge for the Southern District of California, residing in the Northern Division thereof and holding office on the day before the effective date of this section, shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judge for the Eastern District of California whose official station shall be Fresno. The two district judges for the Southern District of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section and whose official station is San Diego shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judges for the Southern District of California, as established by subsection (d) of the first section of this Act. All other other district judges for the Southern District of California holding office on the day before the effective date of this section shall, on and after such effective date, be the district judges for the Central District of California.

SEC. 3. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the Northern District of California, and two additional district judges for the Central District of California.

SEC. 4. Not less than one judge of the Northern District of California shall have his station at San Jose, and not less than one judge in that district shall have his station at Oakland.

SEC. 5. In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28, United States Code, will reflect the changes made by this Act in the number of judicial districts and district judgeships for the State of California, such table is amended to read as follows:

"Districts	*Judges*
* * * * * * *	
California:	
Northern	9
Eastern	3
Central	12
Southern	2
* * * * * * *".	

SEC. 6. The first section and section 2 of this Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act. The other provisions of this Act shall take effect on such date of enactment.

ILL-TIMED AND ILL-COUPLED

(Mr. TAFT (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1963 as proposed to this House is ill-timed and ill-coupled.

The principle of comparability is sound as applied to postal employees and classified civil service employees. I would support these sections of the bill if they stood alone. Even so, the present operating deficit of $10 billion make such increases questionable unless we are willing to enact overall savings in at least the amount of the total resulting annual salary increases. But combined, as these provisions are, with high percentage increases for Members of Congress, the executive branch, and the judiciary, I cannot support the bill. While some of these higher offices may be poorly paid, there seems to be no excuse for such large percentage increases at a time when we are continuing to operate in the red and are cutting taxes out of borrowed funds. It is also doubtful that there is any dearth of applicants for high office in any branch of Government. To the contrary, the size of certain salaries proposed might tend to make the primary objective of some officeseekers a monetary one. Apparently, the war on poverty is to be attacked most fiercely for those above the $20,000 level.

The Member from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], has offered an amendment which would correct some of the serious objections I have made to the bill by striking the legislative salary provision. I join in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Another point, not unconnected with the amendment and the issues I have discussed, is the willingness or refusal of the Members of this House to stand for a rollcall vote on this measure. The failure to have such a recorded vote will rightly be looked upon by the Nation as cowardly and irresponsible and will be a severe blow to the public confidence in Congress as an institution, a confidence that according to some public opinion samplings recently, is at an alltime low. It will also lead the Nation further in an attitude already too prevalent, that public servants, like too many other Americans, are primarily concerned with their own financial reward and little with the general well-being of the country.

ATLANTIC CONVENTION NEEDED WITH IKE A DELEGATE

(Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. BRUCE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, none of our colleagues speaks with more courage and imagination than the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. PAUL FINDLEY has most recently shown both courage and imagination, and political leadership of the highest order, in his call for an Atlantic Convention, with Gen. Dwight Eisenhower in the U.S. Delegation, to consider the formation of a Union of the Free.

I include PAUL FINDLEY'S statement, taken from the March 1964 issue of Freedom and Union, at this point in my remarks, and commend it to my colleagues in the Congress and to the whole leadership of our beloved Nation.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ATLANTIC CONVENTION NEEDED WITH IKE A DELEGATE

(By PAUL FINDLEY, Republican Congressman, 20th District, Illinois)

The same somber tones appropriate in 1787 are required today to paint a picture of the mood and misery that beset the community of freedom.

The community—consisting of 15 free nations—is linked only by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It has been accurately described as the most hopeful agency we have for peace and freedom. But, at best, NATO is but a hopeful beginning. It is far weaker than the Articles of Confederation which were found to be totally inadequate in the 18th century.

If a system was found too flimsy for the horse-and-buggy days, can we safely settle for one still more flimsy for the rocket age?

NATO is an alliance and nothing more. As such, it carries in it the same seeds for self-destruction typical of all alliances. In his farewell address, George Washington warned, in a much-misrepresented passage, against the frailties of all alliances. He said:

"To the efficacy and permanency of your union a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all times have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay by the adoption of a constitution of government better calculated than your former for an intimate union and for the efficacious management of your common concerns."

In short, Washington said that an alliance cannot be an adequate substitute for a government. In words so clear they cannot be misunderstood, he said that alliances "must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances in all time have experienced."

Without exception, alliances have failed to stand the test for time. They are unworthy of confidence. They are fundamentally doomed to failure. The NATO alliance has experienced an abundance of the "infractions and interruptions" which Washington foretold. To cite a few:

Cyprus.

French recognition of Communist China.

British sale of buses to Cuba.

Canadian sale of wheat to Red China.

French blackball of British entry in the Common Market.

U.S. cancellation of Skybolt.

Test ban treaty of Moscow, essentially a bilateral deal between United States and Russia.

Withdrawal of missiles from Turkey and Italy.

U.S. insistence on keeping keys to all NATO nuclear weapons.

Stalemate over the multilateral naval forces proposed.

Broad U.S. tendency toward a detente with Russia, which tends to weaken the thin thread of alliance.

Our nuclear policies now place more trust in our enemies than in our friends. We have never been at war with France at any time since this Republic was founded. And yet, our nuclear policies deny France and other NATO nations the nuclear weapons we know—and they know—the enemy possesses.

We complain when the British sell buses to Cuban Communists, but see nothing wrong in selling wheat to Russia, the heartland of the Communist movement.

We fight a chicken war and now perhaps a beef war with our friends, and hand the enemy super-duper bargains in wheat—better prices than we offer to our friends.

These events—the inevitable infractions and interruptions of which Washington spoke—have caused a steady deterioration of NATO.

When we review our weak followthrough after the Cuban confrontation, the withdrawal of missiles from our NATO allies (Turkey and Italy), our shameful silence over the murder of U.S. airmen over East Germany—who can blame our European allies for wondering if, in a showdown, we would really use nuclear weapons to defend their homes. Who can blame them for seeking, in their own way, to appease the Communists?

Not long ago, I heard one of our top military leaders bitterly exclaim, "We have a minimal deterrent, no-win policy."

Present policies are heading us to ultimate isolation in which liberty will surely perish from within, if not from aggressive forces across our borders. Surrounded by a sea of communism, we would likely resort to police-state methods at home in order to meet the police state menace abroad.

It's high time America's greatest invention—the Federal union system—is put to work anew. Freedom-loving people of the world are needlessly divided and weakened in their quest of peace, liberty and material progress—and in their crucial effort to meet the latest and most ominous of tyrannical forces, international communism.

The barricades which keep these free peoples from uniting today are formidable but certainly no more so than those which separated the original 13 States in 1787.

How can it be done? Where do we start, and when?

Almost precisely 25 years ago—February 9, 1939 to be exact—a book called "Union Now" made its appearance. Written by a New York Times correspondent, Clarence K. Streit, who had witnessed the decay of the League of Nations, it proposed that the Federal union system which has served the people of the United States so brilliantly, be used to join them in a new broader union with other peoples of similar heritage and aspirations.

The peoples to be so united were to be those who had demonstrated a capacity for self-government and a devotion to individual liberty, principally the British Commonwealth of nations, France, the Low Countries and the Scandinavian countries.

Had this union been created in 1939, very clearly the blood bath of World War II would have been avoided. The conquests of Hitler and Mussolini would have ground to a halt. The massive economic, military and moral power brought together in this new Federal union would have undoubtedly ushered in a century, perhaps a millenium, of peace and progress. Micah's dream would have become reality, as most of the swords and spears could safely have been converted to plows and pruning hooks.

But the book stayed too much on the library shelf, and the union was not created. By many, it was considered to be visionary, unrealistic, one-worldish, and by some, downright subversive.

Times have changed. It is now a respectable proposal, given serious consideration in many high circles. Serious thought along this very line is now being given by these leading Republican contenders to the Presidency—Rockefeller, Goldwater, and Nixon.

The people of the United States, and their leaders, are graduating from the grammar school level in the politics of freedom.

We have suffered through the agony of a second worldwide conflict, and many learned from it that we cannot wisely retreat into a fortress-America concept. We have also outlived the illusion that a useful meeting place of the nations, called the United Nations, can be transformed through wishful thinking into a peacekeeping freedom-advancing organization.

We have also outlived the panic which first accompanied realization of the awesome destructive power of the atom. At first, many were impelled to clamor for any kind of accommodation with the enemy to avoid a world holocaust. Now, sober afterthought reminds one of Patrick Henry's question "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

Death by nuclear weapons is no more final than death by the crossbow. Our defense must continue to be the preservation of the spirit of liberty, no matter what the odds and hazards. Abraham Lincoln's definition of defense is just as useful, just as searching and just as appropriate today as a century ago. He said, "Our defense is the preservation of that spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy that spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism around our doors."

NATO in its present form is doomed to failure. Our NATO defense force hangs by the tiny thread of national expediency. Unanimity is required before anything can be done. In the flashing instant of a nuclear showdown, unanimity may come too late or not at all. No one can foretell the decision of any member of NATO—not even our own—until the moment of crisis arrives.

We must build the house of freedom on rock, the solid rock of Federal union to which Washington referred. It is as American as apple pie, and everyday America bespeaks its success.

I propose that the President of the United States assemble a blue-ribbon panel of citizens and invite the leaders of other NATO nations to do the same. Then let these best minds of the free world sit down together, just as our forefathers met in Philadelphia in 1787. Let them fashion and propose for ratification a new standard to which the wise and honest can repair.

The U.S. delegation most certainly should include Dwight D. Eisenhower, the organizer and first commander of NATO, for 8 years President of the United States, better respected throughout the entire world than any other living person, more knowledgeable in the art of free-world diplomacy. First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen of the broad free-world community, General Eisenhower could become the George Washington of the 20th century.

Perhaps, as George Washington himself wrongly predicted of the 1787 Convention, no plan proposed by this convention of 1964 would be adopted. But is there any better hope, a more expectant course to follow? Perhaps, in the gloom and doom of today's problems, we can indeed match the accomplishments of the inventors of the American Republic in 1787. It's worth a first-class effort by first-class minds, because at stake is a first-class ideal: Freedom.

All that is needed is the application of the time-tested system of Federal union to the urgent task of uniting the world's free nations. What better place than Independence Hall itself in Philadelphia?

In the words of John Fiske, historian of the U.S. constitutional period, "In some future still grander convention we trust the same thing will be done between States that have been wholly sovereign, whereby peace may gain and violence be diminished over other lands than this which has set the example."

FINDLEY REPRESENTS COUNTIES LINCOLN DID

By remarkable coincidence, almost to a day 25 years after the author of "Union Now" first made its Atlantic federation proposal public in a lecture on February 9, 1939, Congressman PAUL FINDLEY proposed in a release February 11 that President Johnson name a blue-ribbon panel, including General Eisenhower, to work out a plan to transform NATO into a federal union.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

hope to achieve objectives of long-range value to the Nation unless there is Government interest and support.

That applies to fair foreign trade or unemployment.

There is an erroneous impression that we, and other unions, favor Government intervention into and consequent control over our affairs.

This is absolutely absurd.

We recognize that Government has the right to act at any time in what it deems to be the public interest. But we prefer in labor-management relations to work out our own problems, wherever possible, through the processes of free collective bargaining.

I do believe that the chances of solving our common national problems are considerably enhanced when labor, management, and Government all are sighted in on the same target.

There are a few other illusions I would like to correct before I close.

The first of these is the idea that our union blindly insists on imposing some so-called pattern of wage and social benefits upon all and sundry plants with which we hold contracts.

It is true that we seek the best for all of our people, but it is most untrue that we seek the impossible. Our union always is mindful of, and seeks to make reasonable accommodations to special problems, where these problems are proven to exist.

Nor do we attempt to exercise a voice in the pricing policies, or the profits of the companies with which we have contract relations. We do not want any part of these, or any other rights of management.

We do want our plants and factories to be profitable. We are very well aware that in our democratic capitalistic system, profitable operation is necessary to keep people at work.

There may be one final illusion limited largely to this audience.

And that concerns the idea that I may have something to say about what the United Auto Workers will seek, or perhaps achieve, in the forthcoming negotiations.

The answer is that I do not have anything to say and I will not.

That is a problem which concerns the Auto Workers and the industry.

I hope that it can be resolved amicably and fairly.

Finally, I do not expect to find all acceptance of my ideas in this forum but I do hope that these expressions will generate ideas of your own on the need for solving the common problems.

The time has come for all of us to consider ideas for what they are worth, rather than where they originated.

We must consider that we are in another industrial revolution with the prospect of a social upheaval which may change the world for centuries to come.

In previous eras of great industrial change there always were new lands to settle and cultivate. Today our new frontiers must be established with our brains, rather than with the plow and rifle.

That will take massive intellectual effort.

It is time we all put our minds to the task.

Modernization of Federal Salary Systems

SPEECH
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 1964

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8986) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, in closing the debate I wish to make two points; then I will yield to the majority whip, who will consume about half of the time remaining.

I hope that on tomorrow we will not hear any more of this facetious, preposterous, non sequitur argument that "there are many candidates back home in my district who want to run for Congress" and therefore we should not raise salaries. This has been said a half dozen times today, and I hope we will not hear it tomorrow.

Are those people who make this argument saying that the office of a Member of Congress ought to go to the lowest bidder—that we should reduce the salary to $20,000, to $15,000, to $12,00, to $5,000, and so long as there is one man who says, "I will run for Congress," we will lower it some more?

Then you might have a social occasion and you say, "Ladies and gentlemen, I want to present your Congressman, the only man we could find in nine counties who would go to Washington for this salary we are offering." Logically, if this argument has only validity, that is what we are saying. I think you could get people to run for Congress, if you would, who would pay the U.S. Government $22.500, and those who want real economy here and to improve the Federal fiscal position maybe believe that is something we ought to do, but I will tell you the kind of people we would get, if that is what you are talking about. You would get the kind of people that we do not want in Congress. So I hope, gentlemen, that we will not hear any more of this argument tomorrow.

I said this was a management bill. We have heard talk about the deficit and we do have a deficit, and I am going to do all I can to balance the budget around here.

But let me tell you why this argument is not particularly valid. Let me cite you a case history: In the Defense Department is a man whose responsibilities include, among others, the detailed examination of all aspects of a major weapons system and he must isolate decisions which will be required in the next 5 budget years and be ready with prudent alternatives. These decisions involve hundreds of millions of dollars. This man is a GS–18, at $20,000 a year. He came here from a top executive position with an aircraft maker where he received about $40,000 a year. Every month or so people from industry come in and say to him, "We want you as vice president at $40,000 a year."

So far he has been dedicated. However, when the day comes for him to go, if we take away the hope that we are going to give him a decent salary, you can send all the Members you want down there to say to him, "Let us tell you about our deficit and let us tell you about the national debt and let us tell you about what great trouble the Government has." This fellow, if he has a family and is going to send his children to college, if he can get a better job, unless he is dedicated, is going to say, "I do not care. You go and tell that story about that Federal debt and that deficit and all of the rest of the troubles the Government has to someone else."

I have case histories and I have a dozen of them of people who have been presidents of corporations and who are sought after every month by private corporations to leave their jobs at double and triple their salaries. They hang on because they want to serve the Government. Yet we have had more and more turnover in these critical positions and we lose these men at just about the time they begin to produce for the Government. These positions I might add carry very little honor or prestige.

As the National Association of Manufacturers said:

> If a business were losing money because costs were too high, it might consider hiring some new department heads to cut costs—pay them well for doing it and thus balance the budget.
>
> But not Government.

This is a bill that will do something for the taxpayers and help us to get the kind of Federal Establishment we can all be a little more proud of. I hope the Committee of the Whole tomorrow will support our committee in the particular amendments that are going to be offered and, rollcall or no rollcall, that we will pass this bill, because it is a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time remains to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the majority whip.

Resolution Opposing Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a resolution which has been approved by Ward 3 of the South Carolina Democratic Party in Laurens, S.C., in support of the position being taken by those of us who oppose the so-called civil rights legislation. This resolution has been approved by the Laurens County Democratic Convention and is being forwarded to the South Carolina State Democratic Party Convention which will be held on March 25, 1964.

I appreciate, Mr. President—and I know I speak for all of us in opposition to this power grab legislation—the strong words of encouragement and support which this resolution lends to our cause.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAURENS, S.C., *February 22, 1964.*

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING SOUTHERN SENATORS IN STAND ON CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Whereas it is the prerogative and duty of citizens interested in the common good and welfare of the people to communicate to

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

their representatives in the Congress their feelings and opinions on far-reaching and momentous proposals, and

Whereas in these troublous times, it is apparent that the workshops of the sociologists and the rampagings of extremists are dictating to our courts and being joined by them in trying to change the very way of life of all men overnight, and

Whereas it is obvious that the so-called civil rights bill soon to be debated by the Senate of the United States is the result of high-pressure motivated by a purpose conceived in venegeance and turmoil, nurtured in a vicious climate of exploitation and promoted by ruthless political maneuvers for personal and group advantages that would strip the people of personal, social, civic, civil, and business freedom and liberties and setup a Gestapo-type of organization of marauders that would run roughshod over the minds and hearts of men and reduce to shambles the very foundation upon which this great Nation was founded and built: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That this Democratic Party convention here assembled in Laurens County voice its condemnation of the so-called civil rights bill; further be it

Resolved, That a communication be sent to each of our United States Senators telling them of our support of their stand against the vicious bill.

To be sent to State Democratic convention.

Vietnam Need: Winning the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, for years now some of us have been saying that the only way to win the war in Vietnam was for the Central Government to win the loyalty and allegiance of the people. An article by Takashi Oka in the March 9 issue of the Christian Science Monitor points this out very well, and I include it herewith:

VIETNAM NEED: WINNING THE PEOPLE
(By Takashi Oka)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—To gain victory in South Vietnam's frustrating war against the Communist guerrillas, there must be a shift in emphasis from killing Communists to winning the people.

This is a view widely shared by Vietnamese and Americans with long experience in combating the Vietcong, the Communist guerrillas.

Trite and worn as the phrase "winning the people" may sound, and as many times as lipservice has been paid to this slogan, it is still the irreducible minimum for winning victory, these observers say.

"For 3 years the Pentagon has emphasized military measures—killing the Vietcong," one knowledgeable source commented.

"We've killed thousands of Vietcong, according to our statistics, yet those 45 Vietcong battalions still remain.

"What we have got to do is to get the villagers to defend themselves—motivate them to defend themselves. This will take care of the small unit actions that form the bulk of Vietcong attacks today. Then the regular army can concentrate on the large action—the 300- or 400-men attacks—which villagers obviously can't come with."

The problem is how to motivate the villagers. Some months ago a survey was conducted to determine what a villager actually wanted. The list boiled down to four essentials: first, physical security; second, economic opportunity; third, local self-determination; fourth, the rule of law.

It was obvious that the Communists could not provide any of these four requisites except in a limited degree over limited periods of time. It was clear that the Government of South Vietnam as then constituted also failed to perform this task.

But the government was and is in a far better position to do this than the Communists. And when and as it does, it has a legitimate claim on the loyalty of the villagers.

In another, more recent survey, 33,000 people in a single critical province near Saigon were interviewed. Many grievances against the government came to light.

But the surveyors found that the interviewees also had an active antipathy toward the Communist guerrillas in their midst. In some villages, interviewees supplied rosters of resident Communists at considerable risk to themselves.

Potentially, therefore, the villagers were not "attentistes"—fence sitters. They had definite ideas as to how they wanted the government to function. And to the extent that the government actually did function in this manner it could begin to regain ground lost during the final years of the dictatorial Ngo Dinh Diem regime.

As for the argument that the war should be carried to the north, thoughtful observers here say that it sounds like a panacea which does nothing to solve the primary problem—winning the allegiance of the people in the South Vietnamese countryside.

The war must be fought and won in the south, whatever may happen in the north, these observers say. And in their view this war is in the highest sense a political war. Military means are useful only as this basic fact is recognized and applied.

Panama and the Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 12, 1964

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, yesterday I had the pleasure of meeting with my good friends of Centreville, Md. This meeting, which was so ably arranged and led by Mrs. David Williamson, evidenced the interest and concern of fellow Marylanders about this country's foreign and domestic policies. While there, an article published in the Queen Anne's Record-Observer was called to my attention. The article, written by Capt. Philip W. Reeves, discusses the timely topic of Panama. The captain, who is a master mariner, has seen the canal many times while sailing from New York to California. Therefore, he speaks from a personal knowledge of the situation and his feelings merit examination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In view of the discussions now going on about the Panama Canal, it might be of interest to review, briefly, the canal history.

In 1534 King Charles V of Spain ordered a survey made for a proposed canal across the isthmus.

In 1855 the Panama Railroad across the isthmus from Colon on the Atlantic side to Panama City on the Pacific side, was completed. It is said that a man died for each crosstie in the railroad track. At that time yellow fever was the curse of the tropics. Until the canal was completed passengers and freight were transshipped across the isthmus on this railroad.

Actual construction of the canal was started by the French in January 1880. The French Canal Co. had a concession granted by the Government of Colombia in 1878.

The Panama Railroad, the canal rights and properties of the French Canal Co. were bought by the United States for $40 million in 1904.

The Isthmus of Panama is the principal and most important part of the Republic of Panama. It was originally a part of the Republic of Colombia. Panama was established as an independent Republic at the time when the United States was negotiating for the purchase of the canal properties from the French. The new Republic was made possible by the backing of the United States.

The newly created Republic of Panama granted by treaty, to the United States, the Panama Canal Zone, a right-of-way across the isthmus 10 miles wide and 50 miles long. The Panama Railroad is in this zone. The United States paid the Republic of Panama $10 million and agreed to pay each year, starting 9 years after the treaty was ratified, the sum of $250,000 gold. Since then this sum has been increased until today it is about $2 million.

The treaty with the Republic of Panama was ratified February 26, 1904, and work started on the canal by the U.S. Army Engineers under General Goethals. Panama and the Canal Zone were cleaned up and the yellow fever brought under control. Today sanitary regulations are very strict and the Canal Zone is one of the healthiest places in the world.

When the U.S. Engineers took over the construction of the canal they found that a sea level canal was not practical on account of the difference in the height of the tides on the Atlantic and Pacific sides of the canal. On the Pacific side the tides are 28 feet on the Atlantic side, 4 feet. This is why a sea level canal cannot be built across the isthmus here or in any other location.

Thousands of contract laborers, mostly West Indian Negroes, were brought in to work on the canal. A tough crowd who were kept in order by the Canal Zone police.

The population of the Republic of Panama is a mixture of races. Spanish the official language. Population in 1955 was 911,400.

Panama exports some bananas, coffee, and tropical products. Her main source of income of course, is the canal payments and what business is brought there by the ships using the canal. Most of the local merchants are Chinese or East Indians.

The University of Panama is a small college in the city of Panama. It is doubtful if it would be an accredited college by our standards. The teaching staff like so many others is dominated by Communists who are the plotters and instigators of most of the canal troubles. The student riots that we hear so much about are standard Communist procedure in all Latin American colleges.

The Communist professors and politicians believe that they can steal the canal from the United States by following the example set by Suez. That the politicians in Washington will submit peacefully to their takeover of the canal. All kinds of arguments will be offered in the United Nations to justify their claim. No doubt the Panamanians are taking into consideration the failure of the United States of America to do more than talk about the so-called nationaliza-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

think it covers the entire philosophy well. But I would suggest, too, that you read all of it, and not just part of it. For instance, if you were to read what Mr. Welch has to say about the dangers of communism, the dangers of total statism in this country, the danger of big government, and so forth, most of you would agree right down to the ground, and would start looking for a place to join and pay your $25. I agree with much of what he says. But I did not look for a place to join, because I read all the book, and when I got to the "meat" of the thing and discovered how Robert Welch plans to overcome today's ills of government, I reached for a pencil to make notes on how to warn people I know against this insidious thing.

In "The Blue Book," Mr. Welch designates himself as the savior of the country. He said, "I know in my own mind, beyond all doubt or question, that without dynamic personal leadership around which the split and frustrated and confused forces on our side can be rallied, rapidly and firmly, we do not have a chance of stopping the Communists before they have taken over our country. It is not that you would choose me, or that I would even choose me, against other possibilities. It is simply that under the pressure of time and the exigencies of our need you have no other choice, and neither do I."

What does Robert Welch propose, then? That he becomes a political candidate? That he preach his views from the political stump? That he campaign for the Presidency of the United States? That after educating voters in his philosophy and capabilities, he would stand or fall by the will of the voters of a free community?

You be the judge. In "The Blue Book" he says, "As you look more and more carefully into the hopes that have been bred, and the disappointments that have followed, throughout the political performances of these 20 years, you come increasingly to realize the wisdom of the adage, 'Put not your faith in politicians.' We shall have to use politicians, support politicians, create politicians, and help the best ones we can find to get elected. I am thoroughly convinced, however, that we cannot count on politicians, political leadership, or even political action except as a part of something much deeper and broader, to save us."

These are the words of a potential American dictator. That's why the John Birch Society worries me.

I am going to quote some more from Welch, the authority of the John Birch Society. Listen carefully. He speaks of the society as a monolithic body. Monolithic means "one stone" that supports all else. Welch, obviously, is the stone. In "The Blue Book" he says,

"The John Birch Society is to be a monolithic body. A republican form of government or of organization has many attractions and advantages, under certain favorable conditions. But under less happy circumstances it lends itself too readily to infiltration, distortion, and disruption. And democracy, of course, in government or organization, as the Greeks and Romans both found out, and as I believe every man in this room clearly recognizes * * * democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud. For withstanding the stresses and strains of internal differences and external animosities, throughout changing political climates over long periods of time; for the building of morale and loyalty and a feeling of unified purpose and closely knit strength; for effective functioning in periods of crisis and a permanence of high dedication throughout more peaceful decades; for these and many other reasons, the John Birch Society will operate under completely authoritative control at all levels.

"The fear of tyrannical oppression of individuals, and other arguments against the authoritarian structure in the form of governments, have little bearing on the case of a voluntary association, where the authoritative power can be exercised and enforced only by persuasion. And what little validity they do have is outweighed by the advantages of firm and positive direction of the society's energies. Especially for the near future, and for the fight against communism, which is the first great task of the society. It is imperative that all the strength we can muster be subject to smoothly functioning direction from the top."

Did you listen? The last line I quoted from Robert Welch was, "Especially for the near future, and for the fight against communism, which is the first great task of the society, it is imperative * * *" et cetera, et cetera.

When I first read that, there flashed to my mind the slogan of the arrogant Nazis of Hitler in the thirties, "Today Germany. Tomorrow the world."

I have tried to be factual and unemotional about this subject. I can vouch for my facts. I can't vouch for my emotions. I can't remain unemotional in the face of a threat to individual liberty, whether it come from the far left or the far right.

The word "militant" is not misused in speaking of "militant far left" and "militant far right." It has its base in the Latin word "miles" which means soldier." Its connotation is "force" in direct contrast to "reason."

Good-afternoon, everyone. Thanks for listening.

CONGRESSIONAL SALARY BILL

(Mr. HECHLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, there have been many opinions expressed during the past 2 days on this legislation. There have been many difficult decisions made by those supporting and opposing the bill. As with so may bills which confront us, the issues were not black and white. I am sure that all Members examined this legislation carefully and for varying reasons cast their vote in support of or in opposition to the legislation.

During the debate, there were many flashes of brilliance. Although I voted against final passage of the bill, to me one of the greatest stars of this debate was the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL.] He exhibited great qualities of courage, leadership, oratory, and parliamentary skill. Few Members of this body have come so far in so short a time. This debate marks him as one of the truly great Members of the House.

I voted against this bill because of an honest conviction that the proposed raises in congressional salaries were poorly timed. Coming on the heels of a tax cut and at a time when we are trying to reduce Federal expenditures the congressional salary raise did not seem to me to be appropriate. It is patently true, however, that early action should be taken to provide a more realistic system of expense allowances for Members of Congress. In particular, with most Members making many official business trips to their disrticts, the travel allowance should more nearly equal the actual official expenditures. If the travel and other expense allowances were computed on a more realistic basis, the pressure for a salary increase would lessen. I believe it is high time that Members of Congress be placed on the same relative basis for charging their expenses as are representatives of any business firm. Although I respect the motives of every one of my colleagues, I personally do not believe that a salary raise can be justified to counterbalance the skimpy travel allowance and other expense allowances.

CIVIL RIGHTS OR CIVIL WRONGS?

(Mr. WAGGONNER (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that one of the largest newspapers in the United States, the Chicago Tribune, has joined the chorus of northern newspapers who are now actively opposing the infamous civil rights bill.

I will not chastise them for not having made known the truth about this bill a year or more ago when the true content of this bill began to take shape. If they had publicized the fact that this measure is 90 percent devoted to a massive grab for Federal power and domination over all Americans and 10 percent concerned with vaguely defined rights of a minority, then we might have had a few more votes in opposition to the bill when it was considered here in the House recently.

I hope that what they have to say is not too late to impress some of the Members of the other body.

I would like to insert here in the RECORD the Chicago Tribune's editorial titled "Civil Rights or Civil Wrongs," and the article by Prof. Robert Bork, of Yale University, to which reference is made:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

CIVIL RIGHTS OR CIVIL WRONGS?

Changing times? What do you mean? The only thing that has changed has been the method man has used to destroy what he has built up. To destroy it under the mystical Pied Piper illusion of civil rights is merely finding a new way of accomplishing what man has been doing since history first recorded his yearning to be free. We have stood as an exception to the trend, in my judgment, for one basic reason: the wise constitutional limitations on actions of government. Now I am not so sure—Representative JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Republican, of Ohio.

The Tribune has given extended attention in its news columns set on its editorial page to the 11 titles of the civil rights bill which is now before the Senate after approval by the House. We did so in the belief that there was not one person out of 10,000 who had more than the faintest conception of the contents of the bill or the sweeping implications and probable effects of this legislation.

At the conclusion of our factual presentation and parallel editorial comment, we opened our pages Sunday to two professors of law, one from the University of Chicago, one from the Yale law faculty, presenting opposing opinions on the merits and constitutionality of the bill.

Prof. Philip B. Kurrland spoke for the legislation. Prof. Robert Bork spoke against it. As the legal battle of the century, this turned out to be something less than the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Clay-Liston brawl. It was as if both gladiators developed sore arms and failed to respond to the bell for the seventh round. We shall not, however, hold up their purses on that account.

Mr. Bork proved a cautious constitutionalist. Mr. Kurland was the Clay of the engagement, shouting, "I'm the greatest," and to the Tribune, "Eat your words." He embroidered the occasions by reiterating himself of some curdled resentments of less standing against this newspaper. We think we'll survive.

Among Mr. Kurland's other aspersions was that the Tribune, both in its news stories and editorial comment, offered the arguments only of antagonists of the bill. Should he chance to read the debate in the House, together with the majority and minority reports of the Judiciary Committee, he will discover that the majority coalition offered almost no arguments in support of the constitutionality of the various provisions.

It had the votes and chose to avoid constitutional justification, perhaps for the reason that the bill was unloaded on the Judiciary Committee at the last minute by the Department of Justice and committee debate was limited to 1 minute for both the Democratic majority and the Republican minority, the leaders of which were both committed to the bill, sight unseen.

The constitutional arguments were thus confined to opponents of the bill when debate began. It is noteworthy that the two most effective speeches against the bill were made by northern Republicans—Representative ASHBROOK, of Ohio and Representative WYMAN, of New Hampshire. The benighted southerners who opposed the bill signified that they at least knew the Constitution and the law. They argued intelligently, if unavailingly, and were gifted with a humor conspicuously absent from the ranks of righteousness.

If we chose, we could throw a little constitutional law back at Mr. Kurland. He ignores the fact that an unreversed Supreme Court decision in 1883 held unconstitutional a public accommodations act strikingly similar to that in the present bill, except that it was based solely on the 14th amendment and did not also appeal to the commerce clause. This is the only section of the 1964 bill which Mr. Kurland argued at length.

Mr. Kurland cites law to his purpose. We could cite Supreme Court decisions on the other side, such as the Wilmington Parking Authority case of 1961, the Greenville case of 1963, the Howard Johnson case of 1959, and the "broken package doctrine." But the effort is hardly rewarding. We will concede Mr. Kurland one thing: Any constitutional question bearing the sacred tag of "civil rights" is most likely to find Chief Justice Warren and the "liberal" majority on the wrong side of the facts and the law.

As we have said, the civil rights bill is a vast invasion and usurpation on the part of the Federal Government of the rights of business, individuals, unions, homeowners, and everyone else. It has been declared to be—we believe truthfully—90 percent concerned with the extension of Federal power and 10 percent with any rights which can be so described. It is a distortion of the public interest, requiring that 89.9 percent of the population accommodate itself to the convenience of the remaining 10.1 percent, especially as regards privacy, association, and choice. If these relinquishments were based on sound constitutional command, they might be accepted, if not welcomed, but we do not find it so.

The legislation, further, rewards those who, by promoting lawbreaking and civil clamor, have occasioned much of the domestic vexation of the country. It is a payoff to a Martin Luther King who says that laws not to his satisfaction are to be broken. It is an appeasement of an ADAM CLAYTON POWELL who proclaims, "We've got the white man on the run," and advises Negro citizens to "think as a bloc, act as a bloc, and vote as a bloc." When injunctions of morality are invoked, such sentiments are not irrelevant.

Moreover, the provisions of this bill, if they become law, will not prove even a halfway house. Demands will mount until constitutional restrictions become as a broken rubber band. In time, we shall all be under an absolutism that will make the Orwell account of 1984 look like a nursery story. We predict that nonwhites, who were making steady progress through the amelioration of once-hardened attitudes, are going to like the outcome as little as whites.

AGAINST THE BILL

(By Robert H. Bork)

The major issue concerning the civil rights bill now to be considered by the Senate is not whether private racial prejudice is unjust—it is—but whether it is either proper or wise for the Government to prohibit it by law. These are two very different questions, and their difference raises basic questions about the sort of society we want to live in.

Much of the civil rights bill (e.g., the sections on voting rights and desegregation of public education) is admirable. But there are serious and substantial difficulties connected with the public accommodations and employment provisions. Such laws would:

1. Adopt a principle of enforcing associations between private individuals which would, if uniformly applied, destroy personal freedom over broad areas of life.

2. Raise serious constitutional problems which would not be removed even by a Supreme Court decision upholding the law.

3. Prove impossible to enforce effectively, and so have deleterious effects both upon law observance generally and prospects for peaceful solutions to racial problems in particular.

4. By recognizing race and religion as proper topics for explicit legislation, and political struggle, perhaps worsen rather than improve the relationships of racial and religious groups in American society.

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

Much of the unsatisfactory situation of Negroes in American society today is directly due to discriminatory laws, particularly in the South, which have long forbidden or regulated many associations of Negroes and whites regardless of the desires of the individuals concerned.

Such laws are, of course, completely unjustifiable. They are and have been under steady attack in the Federal courts and it seems certain that all of them will meet the constitutional doom they deserve.

The proposed public accommodations and employment practices laws, however, would reverse this situation and compel association even where it is not desired.

The accommodations law, for example, would inform all owners of specified businesses that in order to continue in their established trades they must deal with and serve persons with whom they do not wish to associate. It would, similarly, inform all customers of such businesses that they must sacrifice what seems to some of them an important aspect of their personal liberty in order to enjoy the services and goods of any such commercial establishment.

A VALUE OF HIGH PRIORITY

The case for freedom, as many proponents of this bill are fond of pointing out when other issues are at stake, is usually most important precisely where it is most difficult to make. The temptation is to despise the freedom of those whose preferences we disapprove.

Yet freedom is a value of such high priority and may so easily slip away that a very heavy burden of proof rests upon those who ask us to sacrifice it to other ends.

It is not enough to be assured that some people use their freedom badly and that others are thereby affronted or even made to suffer. The same could be said of many other freedoms that we continue to retain.

Moreover, the intrusion upon freedom represented by a public accommodations and employment practices law would be of an extraordinary nature—for it is extraordinary that Government should regulate the associations of private persons.

DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

And this law would set a particularly dangerous precedent because of the logical and political impossibility of confining its principle of coercing private associations to the particular areas it covers. If the owners and patrons of the commercial establishments reached by this bill (roughly: restaurants, hotels and motels, gas stations, and theaters) are to be denied freedom of association in the name of a larger morality, how can that freedom be left to any seller of goods or services?

There is, in fact, no reason to confine the principle of enforced association to commercial relationships.

Recent headlines make it completely clear that the demand for Government-enforced association does not stop at the boundaries of the commercial world but is being pressed aggressively in other areas of life. The accommodations and employment provisions of the civil rights bill cannot be viewed in isolation but must be assessed as only a modest first step in a broad program of coerced social change.

If, therefore, the principle of enforced association which underlies this bill were uniformly applied (and, of course, if it is a good principle it ought to be uniformly applied), we would have a greatly different society from the one we now enjoy. The new one might possibly be more just and moral, but it would quite certainly be far less free. It seems a bad exchange. We would do better to continue to rely upon social change, which is taking place, through free and uncoerced evolution.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS

Many constitutional problems are raised by the civil rights bill but among the most serious are those raised by the public accommodations section. The House bill rests that section both upon Congress' constitutional power to regulate interstate commerce and upon the 14th amendment.

The law would reach about as far as possible under the interstate commerce power. It provides, for instance, that no lunch counter owner can discriminate if a "substantial portion" of the food he serves has moved in interstate commerce.

The results are plain for the concept of federalism, the historic idea that there are important powers wholly reserved to the States and beyond the reach of the National Government.

If Congress can dictate the selection of customers in a remote Georgia diner because the canned soup once crossed a State line, federalism—so far as it limits national power to control behavior through purported economic regulation—is dead.

To be sure, it has not shown much life for some time, but this would be the last nail in the coffin lid. Few bills when considered by Congress have had as little arguable connection with interstate commerce. No one even seriously pretends that regulation of commerce is the real motive here.

Rather, a tenuous past connection with a movement across a State line is made the pretext by which Congress imposes its view of individual morality within the boundaries of a State. There is little doubt the Supreme Court would uphold the attempt but that certainly does not mean that Congress itself should continue to use its commerce power to accomplish ends that, whatever their other

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1964

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 8: 12: *I am the light of the world; He that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.*

Almighty God, our Father, who art high and holy, we rejoice that Thou hast respect unto the lowly and art mindful that human life is often so fragile and fleeting, and so tangled and turbulent.

We earnestly beseech Thee to defend us against those beseiging vanities and those rude cynicisms of the world which are seeking to undermine our character and corrupt that finer spirit with which we have been endowed when Thou didst create man in Thine own image.

Grant that in all the days of our life we may bear testimony to Thy divine image and may our life be invested with a dignity and a worth which has enduring sanctity and eternal significance.

May we be numbered among those who are aspiring and struggling to achieve the better and nobler life, and following with a passionate and persistent fidelity those ways which Thou hast marked out for us.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "an act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," had appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 64–11.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tomorrow night to file a privileged report on the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HARRISON reserved all points of order on the bill.)

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Bass	Duncan	Powell
Battin	Green, Oreg.	Rains
Bonner	Griffiths	Roberts, Ala.
Brademas	Hoffman	St Germain
Brown, Calif.	Kee	St. Onge
Burton, Calif.	King, Calif.	Scott
Celler	Martin, Nebr.	Sheppard
Clausen, Don H.	Mathias	Shipley
Curtin	May	Short
Davis, Tenn.	Meader	Wilson, Charles H.
Denton	Nelsen	
Dowdy	O'Brien, Ill.	
	Pepper	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 397 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks appearing in the March 4, 1964, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 4161, in an article entitled "The 175th Anniversary of the U.S. Federal Union," in line 8 of the second paragraph of my remarks, in column 1, the following sentence appears:

In Fraunce's Tavern at the corner of Pearl and Broad Streets a group of citizens, including Clarence K. Streit, author and editor, today met in the very room where the First Congress under the new Federal Constitution met on March 4, 1789.

In that sentence the words "in the very room" should be changed to read "near Federal Hall."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last, when the vote was taken on the passage of the bill H.R. 8070, relating to the establishment of a Public Land Law Review Commission, I was absent. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

MODERNIZATION OF FEDERAL SALARY SYSTEMS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 8986) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 8986, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the further reading of title I was dispensed with and title I is open to amendment at any point.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURRAY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, in the nature of a substitute to title I of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: On page one strike out line 3 and all that follows down through line 12 on page 35 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964'.

"TITLE I—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY SYSTEMS

"Short title

"SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964'.

"Classification Act employees

"SEC. 102. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (76 Stat. 843; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"'Grade	"'Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,385	$3,500	$3,615	$3,730	$3,845	$3,960	$4,075	$4,190	$4,305	$4,420
GS-2	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430	4,555	4,680	4,805
GS-3	4,005	4,140	4,275	4,410	4,545	4,680	4,815	4,950	5,085	5,220
GS-4	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830
GS-5	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,155	6,320	6,485
GS-6	5,505	5,690	5,875	6,060	6,245	6,430	6,615	6,800	6,985	7,170
GS-7	6,050	6,250	6,450	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250	7,450	7,650	7,850
GS-8	6,630	6,850	7,070	7,290	7,510	7,730	7,950	8,170	8,390	8,610
GS-9	7,210	7,455	7,700	7,945	8,190	8,435	8,680	8,925	9,170	9,415
GS-10	7,840	8,110	8,380	8,650	8,920	9,190	9,460	9,730	10,000	10,270
GS-11	8,550	8,845	9,140	9,435	9,730	10,025	10,320	10,615	10,910	11,205
GS-12	10,200	10,565	10,930	11,295	11,660	11,975	12,330	12,695	13,040	13,395
GS-13	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
GS-14	14,170	14,660	15,150	15,640	16,130	16,620	17,110	17,600	18,090	18,580
GS-15	16,460	17,030	17,600	18,170	18,740	19,310	19,880	20,450	21,020	21,590
GS-16	18,935	19,590	20,245	20,900	21,555	22,210	22,865	23,520	24,175	-------
GS-17	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
GS-18	24,500	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

"(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

"(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

"(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2(b) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111; Public Law 763, Eighty-third Congress), plus the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, by section 112 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960, and by section 602 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of (A) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under such section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, (B) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, by section 112 of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, (D) the amount of the increase provided by section 112 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960, (E) the amount of the increases in schedule I and schedule II provided by section 602 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, and (F) the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purpose of section 208(b) of such Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of such employee.

"(5) If the officer or employee is in a position in grade 16 or 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to which he was promoted on or after the first day of his first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, and if he holds such position, or another position in the same grade, on the effective date of this section, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted, as of such effective date, to that rate of basic compensation to which he would have been entitled if the compensation schedule in subsection (a) of this section had been in effect on the date of his promotion.

"SEC. 103. (a) Section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1131), relating to new appointments, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 801. All new appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade, except that in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission which provide for such considerations as the candidate's existing salary, unusually high or unique qualifications, or a special need of the Government for his services, the head of any department may appoint individuals to positions in grade 13 and above of the General Schedule at such rate or rates above the minimum rate of the appropriate grade as the Commission may authorize for this purpose.'.

"(b) Section 1105 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1071, note and 1082, note), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 1105. The provisions of section 507, title VII, and title VIII of this Act shall not apply to professional engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and professional positions in the physical and natural sciences and medicine placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule in accordance with subsection (b) or subsection (j) of section 505 of this Act. The President or an agency or agencies that he designates shall issue regulations governing the rate of basic compensation within the grade to be received by any officer or employee occupying, appointed to, or promoted to, such a position and, in the case of reduction in grade, may issue regulations governing retention of the rate to which the officer or employee was entitled immediately before reduction.'

"(c) Section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(b)), relating to the limitation on numbers of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of such Act, is amended by striking out 'which may be placed in such grades' and by inserting in lieu thereof ', examiner positions under section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 244; 5 U.S.C. 1010), and positions placed under this Act pursuant to section 309 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, which may be placed in such grades'.

"(d) Section 604(d)(3) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 944(c)(3)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) All rates shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.'.

"Postal field service employees

"SEC. 104. Section 1 of title 39, United States Code is amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

"'"revenue unit" means that amount of revenue of a post office from mail and special service transactions which is equal to the average sum of postal rates and fees received by the Department during the fiscal year for 1,000 pieces of originating mail and special service transactions determined in accordance with section 2331 of this title.'.

"SEC. 105. Section 702 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 702. Classes of post offices

"'(a) Effective at the beginning of each fiscal year the Postmaster General shall divide post offices into four classes on the basis of the revenue units of each office for the second preceding fiscal year. He shall place in the first class those post offices having 950 or more revenue units. He shall place in the second class those post offices having 190 or more revenue units, but less than 950 revenue units. He shall place in the third class those post offices having 36 or more revenue units, but less than 190 revenue units. He shall place in the fourth class those post offices having less than 36 revenue units.

"'(b) The Postmaster General shall exclude from the revenue credited to a post office for the purposes of this section money received at that office for—

"'(1) setting meters for patrons beyond the area served by the office unless authorized by the Department;

"'(2) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold in large or unusual quantities to be used in mailing matter at other offices; and

"'(3) stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards sold for mailing matter diverted from other offices and mailing of matter so diverted without stamps affixed.

"'(c) Whenever unusual conditions prevail at a post office of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate class based on his estimate of the number of revenue units which the office will have during the succeeding twelve months. Any office so advanced need not be relegated to a lower class before the end of the second fiscal year after the advancement. At that time, the office shall be assigned to the appropriate class in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) of this section.'.

"SEC. 106. Section 704 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting 'of the first, second, or third class' appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof '(other than one for which the postmaster furnishes quarters, equipment, and fixtures on an allowance basis)'.

"SEC. 107. Subsection (b)(1) of section 2102 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"'(1) for post offices at which the postmaster does not furnish quarters on an allowance basis;'.

"SEC. 108. (a) Section 3501 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by—

"(1) deleting from the first sentence of subsection (a) the following: 'standard positions of postmaster in a fourth class office and rural carrier' and inserting in lieu thereof 'standard position of rural carrier'; and

"(2) inserting a new subsection (c) following subsection (b) as follows:

"'(c) As of the effective date of this section, the Postmaster General shall determine and adjust the rankings of all positions for which the number of annual revenue units of a post office or its class is a relevant factor of the ranking, using the revenue units of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and the class of the office as of July 1, 1964. Thereafter the Postmaster General shall determine and, effective at the beginning of the first pay period in each calendar year, shall adjust the rankings of all positions for which the number of annual revenue units of a post office or its class is a relevant factor of the ranking, using the revenue units of the preceding fiscal year and the class in which the office will be placed at the begininng of the next fiscal year. The Postmaster General also may adjust rankings of such positions at other times of the year based upon substantial changes in service conditions.'.

"(b) Chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) In subsection (c) of section 3513—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POST OFFICE CLERK. (KP–4)'; and

"(B) Add the following new sentence to the end of paragraph (1): 'This office has less than 190 revenue units annually.'.

"(2) In subsection (e) of section 3516—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–18)';

"(B) Delete 'third class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of approximately $1,700' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 40 revenue units annually'.

"(3) In subsection (b) of section 3517—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–20)';

"(B) Delete 'third class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of approximately $4,700' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 110 revenue units annually'.

"(4) In subsection (b) of section 3518—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–22)';

"(B) Delete 'third class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of approximately $6,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 140 revenues units annually'.

"(5) In subsection (b) of section 3519—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–24)'; and

"(B) Delete 'annual receipts of approximately $63,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 1,490 revenue units annually'.

"(6) In subsection (c) of section 3519—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–25)';

"(B) Delete 'second class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of approximately $16,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 380 revenue units annually'.

"(7) In subsection (b) of section 3520—

"(A) Change the catchline to read "POSTMASTER. (KP–27)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of approximately $63,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 1,490 revenue units annually'.

"(8) In subsection (b) of section 3521—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–29)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' appearing in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $129,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 3,060 revenue units annually'.

"(9) In subsection (b) of section 3522—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–31)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $314,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 7,450 revenue units annually'.

"(10) In subsection (b) of section 3523—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–33)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' appearing in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof: 'This office has approximately 110 employees, approximately 14,350 revenue units annually, 13 government-owned vehicle units, one classified station and 42 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.'.

"(11) In subsection (b) of section 3524—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–35)'; and

"(B) Delete 'annual receipts of $2,700,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 64,000 revenue units annually'.

"(12) In subsection (c) of section 3524—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–36)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $1,000,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 23,700 revenue units annually'.

"(13) In subsection (a) of section 3525—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–37)'; and

"(B) Delete 'annual receipts of $8,460,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 200,000 revenue units annually'.

"(14) In subsection (b) of section 3525—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–38)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $2,700,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 64,000 revenue units annually'.

"(15) In subsection (a) of section 3526—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–39)'; and

"(B) Delete 'annual receipts of $16,900,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 400,000 revenue units annually'.

"(16) In subsection (b) of section 3526—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–40)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $4,470,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 106,000 revenue units annually'.

"(17) In subsection (b) of section 3527—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–42)'; and

"(B) Delete 'annual receipts of $48,000,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 1,000,000 revenue units annually'.

"(18) In subsection (c) of section 3527—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–43)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $8,460,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 200,000 revenue units annually'.

"(19) In subsection (b) of section 3528—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'ASSISTANT POSTMASTER. (KP–45)'; and

"(B) Delete 'annual receipts of $140,000,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 2,500,000 revenue units annually'.

"(20) In subsection (c) of section 3528—

"(A) Change the catchline to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–46)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $16,900,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu threeof 'approximately 400,000 revenue units annually'.

"(21) In section 3529—

"(A) Change the catchline immediately preceding paragraph (1) to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–47)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $48,000,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 1,000,000 revenue units annually'.

"(22) In section 3530—

"(A) Change the catchline immediately preceding paragraph (1) to read 'POSTMASTER. (KP–48)';

"(B) Delete 'first class' in the first sentence of paragraph (1); and

"(C) Delete 'annual receipts of $140,000,000' in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof 'approximately 2,500,000 revenue units annually'.

"SEC. 109. Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows—

"'(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be "PFS". Except as provided in section 3543 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"'Postal field service schedule

"'PFS	"'Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$3,945	$4,075	$4,205	$4,335	$4,465	$4,595	$4,725	$4,855	$4,985	$5,115	$5,245	$5,375
2	4,270	4,410	4,550	4,690	4,830	4,970	5,110	5,250	5,390	5,530	5,670	5,810
3	4,615	4,770	4,926	5,080	5,235	5,390	5,545	5,700	5,855	6,010	6,165	6,320
4	5,000	5,165	5,330	5,495	5,660	5,825	5,990	6,156	6,320	6,485	6,650	6,815
5	5,345	5,525	5,705	5,885	6,065	6,245	6,425	6,605	6,785	6,965	7,145	7,325
6	5,735	5,925	6,115	6,305	6,495	6,685	6,875	7,065	7,255	7,445	7,635	7,825
7	6,140	6,345	6,550	6,755	6,960	7,165	7,370	7,575	7,780	7,985	------	------
8	6,650	6,870	7,090	7,310	7,530	7,750	7,970	8,190	8,410	8,630	------	------
9	7,190	7,430	7,670	7,910	8,150	8,390	8,630	8,870	9,110	9,350	------	------
10	7,830	8,095	8,360	8,625	8,890	9,155	9,420	9,685	9,950	10,215	------	------
11	8,650	8,945	9,240	9,535	9,830	10,125	10,420	10,715	11,010	11,305	------	------
12	9,570	9,895	10,220	10,545	10,870	11,195	11,520	11,845	12,170	12,495	------	------
13	10,575	10,940	11,305	11,670	12,035	12,400	12,765	13,130	13,495	13,860	------	------
14	11,660	12,065	12,470	12,875	13,280	13,685	14,090	14,495	14,900	15,305	------	------
15	12,885	13,330	13,776	14,220	14,665	15,110	15,555	16,000	16,445	16,890	------	------
16	14,240	14,735	15,230	15,726	16,220	16,715	17,210	17,705	18,200	18,695	------	------
17	15,755	16,305	16,855	17,405	17,955	18,505	19,055	19,605	20,155	20,705	------	------
18	17,450	18,060	18,670	19,280	19,890	20,500	21,110	21,720	22,330	22,940	------	------
19	19,345	20,020	20,695	21,370	22,045	22,720	23,395	24,070	------	------	------	------
20	21,445	22,195	22,945	23,695	24,445	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

"SEC. 110. Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows—

"'(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be "RCS".

"'Rural carrier schedule

	"'Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carriers in rural delivery service:												
Fixed compensation per annum	$2,240	$2,345	$2,450	$2,555	$2,660	$2,765	$2,870	$2,975	$3,080	$3,185	$3,290	$3,395
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	82	84	86	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25'.

"SEC. 111. (a) Section 3544 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 3544. Compensation of Postmasters at Fourth-Class Offices

"'(a) The Postmaster General shall rank the position of postmaster of fourth-class offices in level 5 of the Postal Field Service Schedule and shall establish the annual rate of basic compensation for each such position in the proportion of the annual rate of basic compensation for positions in PFS–5 which he determines, in consideration of the postal needs of the patrons of the office, that the postmaster's hours of service bear to full-time service. Determinations made by the Postmaster General under this subsection shall be final and conclusive until changed by him.

"'(b) Persons who perform the duties of postmaster at a post office of the fourth class where there is a vacancy or during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave or leave without pay shall be compensated at the rate of basic compensation for PFS level 5, step 1, determined in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

"'(c) At seasonal post offices of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may authorize the payment of basic salary prorated over the pay periods the office is open for business during the fiscal year.

"'(d) When required by the Postmaster General a postmaster at a fourth-class office shall, and any other postmaster in PFS level 5 when permitted by the Postmaster General may, furnish quarters, fixtures, and equipment for an office on an allowance basis. The allowance for this purpose shall be an amount equal to 15 per centum of the basic compensation for the postmaster at the office computed on the basis of the first step of PFS level 5.'.

"(b) In the operation of the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section, the following provisions shall govern:

"(1) Each postmaster at a fourth-class office on the effective date of this section shall be assigned, as of such date—

"(A) to that numerical step of level 5 of the Postal Field Service Schedule (PFS–5) which corresponds to the numerical step of the Fourth-Class Office Schedule (FOS) receipts category which he occupied immediately prior to such assignment, or

"(B) to the lowest step of level 5 of the Postal Field Service Schedule (PFS–5) which will provide him, for the number of hours of service determined under section 3544 of title 39, United States Code, compensation which is not less than the compensation to which he would otherwise be entitled, on the effective date of this section, under Fourth Class Schedule II (as if such schedule were in effect on such date),

whichever step provides the higher rate of compensation.

"(2) If no step in level 5 of the Postal Field Service Schedule (PFS–5) will provide a postmaster, so assigned under paragarph (1) of this subsection, with compensation which is equal to or greater than the compensation which he would have received under Fourth Class Schedule II (as if such schedule were in effect on the effective date of this section), such postmaster shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the applicable rate fixed under Fourth Class Schedule II (as if such schedule were in effect on the effective date of this section) and the provisions of section 3544 of title 39, United States Code (as such provisions existed immediately prior to the effective date of this section). Subject to the provisions of section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, the compensation of a postmaster paid in accordance with the immediately preceding sentence shall be adjusted in accordance with changes in the gross postal receipts of his post office as though this Act had not been enacted. The compensation of a postmaster paid in accordance with any of the foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall continue in effect until such a postmaster is entitled to receive compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law.

"(3) If changes in the gross postal receipts category or changes in salary step otherwise would occur on the effective date of this section (without regard to the enactment of this section), such changes shall be held and considered to have occurred prior to assignment under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(c) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting:

"'3544. Fourth Class Office Schedule.';

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'3544. Compensation of Postmasters at Fourth-Class Offices.',

"SEC. 112. (a) Subsection (a) of section 6007 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The Postmaster General shall pay to persons, other than special delivery messengers at post offices of the first class, for making delivery of special delivery mail such fees as may be established by him not in excess of the special delivery fee.'.

"(b) Section 3009 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting 'at any price less than eight cents per piece' and inserting in lieu thereof 'at any price less than the fees established pursuant to section 6007(a) of this title.'.

"SEC. 113. Section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by deleting from subsection (a) '(3) gross receipts category, with respect to the Fourth-Class Office Schedule' and inserting in lieu thereof '(3) minimum hours of service with respect to postmasters in fourth-class post offices and

"(2) by deleting from subsection (f) '(1) reductions in class or gross receipts category of any post office, or' and inserting in lieu thereof '(1) reductions in class, revenue units of any post office, or the minimum hours of service for a fourth-class post office, or'.

"SEC. 114. Section 711 of title 39, United States Code, is repealed.

"SEC. 115. The table of contents of chapter 7 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting

"'711. Method of determining gross receipts.'.

"SEC. 116. The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule or the Rural Carrier Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

"(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

"(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this section, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

"Employees in the Deparment of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration

"SEC. 117. (a) Section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the appoint-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ment and annual salaries of certain staff positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director

"'(a) The Office of the Chief Medical Director shall consist of the following—

"'(1) The Chief Medical Director, who shall be the Chief of the Department of Medicine and Surgery and shall be directly responsible to the Administrator for the operations of the Department. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

"'Section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), shall not apply to any individual oppointed Chief Medical Director before January 1, 1964; but section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a), shall apply, in accordance with its terms, to any such individual.

"'(2) The Deputy Chief Medical Director, who shall be the principal assistant of the Chief Medical Director. He shall be a qualified doctor of medicine, appointed by the Administrator.

"'(3) Not to exceed five Assistant Chief Medical Directors, who shall be appointed by the Administrator upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director. One Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine who shall be directly responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Dental Service.

"'(4) Such Medical Directors as may be appointed by the Administrator, upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director, to suit the needs of the Department. A Medical Director shall be either a qualified doctor of medicine or a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine.

"'(5) A Director of Nursing Service, who shall be a qualified registered nurse, appointed by the Administrator, and who shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Nursing Service.

"'(6) A Chief Pharmacist and a Chief Dietitian, appointed by the Administrator.

"'(7) Such other personnel and employees as may be authorized by this chapter.

"'(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any appointment under this section shall be for a period of four years, with reappointment permissible for successive like periods, except that persons so appointed or reappointed shall be subject to removal by the Administrator for cause.

"'(c) The Administrator may designate a member of the Chaplain Service of the Veterans' Administration as Director, Chaplain Service, for a period of two years, subject to removal by the Administrator for cause. Redesignation under this subsection may be made for successive like periods. An individual designated as Director, Chaplain Service, shall at the end of his period of service as Director revert to the position, grade, and status which he held immediately prior to being designated Director, Chaplain Service, and all service as Director, Chaplain Service, shall be creditable as service in the former position.'.

"(b) The table of contents of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"'4103. Appointments and compensation.'

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"'4103. Office of the Chief Medical Director.'.

"SEC. 118. Section 4107 of title 39, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"'(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"'Section 4103 schedule

"'Assistant Chief Medical Director, $24,500.

"'Medical Director, $21,445 minimum to $24,445 maximum.

"'Director of Nursing Service, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"'Director, Chaplain Service, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"'Chief Pharmacist, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"'Chief Dietitian, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"'(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"'Physician and dentist schedule

"'Director grade, $18,935 minimum to $24,175 maximum.

"'Executive grade, $17,655 minimum to $23,190 maximum.

"'Chief grade, $16,460 minimum to $21,590 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $14,170 minimum to $18,580 mixiumum.

"'Intermediate grade, $12,075 minimum to $15,855 maximum.

"'Full grade, $10,200 minimum to $13,395 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $8,550 minimum to $11,205 maximum.

"'Nurse schedule

"'Assistant Director grade, $14,170 minimum to $18,580 maximum.

"'Chief grade, $12,075 minimum to $15,855 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $10,200 minimum to $13,395 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $8550, minimum to $11,205 maximum.

"'Full grade, $7,210 minimum to $9,415 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $6,315 minimum to $8,215 maximum.

"'Junior grade, $5,505 minimum to $7,170 maximum.

"'(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position.'.

"Foreign Service officers; staff officers and employees

"SEC. 119. Section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows:

"'Foreign Service officers

"'SEC. 412. There shall be 10 classes of Foreign Service officers, including the classes of career ambassador and of career minister. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be at the rate provided by law for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be at the rate provided by law for level V of such schedule. The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"'Class 1	$22,650	$23,440	$24,500				
Class 2	18,295	18,930	19,565	$20,200	$20,835	$21,470	$22,105
Class 3	14,860	15,375	15,890	16,405	16,920	17,435	17,950
Class 4	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595
Class 5	9,900	10,245	10,590	10,935	11,280	11,625	11,970
Class 6	8,205	8,490	8,775	9,060	9,345	9,630	9,915
Class 7	7,000	7,235	7,470	7,705	7,940	8,175	8,410
Class 8	6,050	6,250	6,450	6,650	6,850	7,050	7,250'.

"SEC. 120. Subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) There shall be ten classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees. The per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"'Class 1	$14,860	$15,375	$15,890	$16,405	$16,920	$17,435	$17,950	$18,465	$18,980	$19,495
Class 2	12,075	12,495	12,915	13,335	13,755	14,175	14,595	15,015	15,435	15,855
Class 3	9,900	10,245	10,590	10,935	11,280	11,625	11,970	12,315	12,660	13,005
Class 4	8,205	8,490	8,775	9,060	9,345	9,630	9,915	10,200	10,485	10,770
Class 5	7,405	7,660	7,915	8,170	8,425	8,680	8,935	9,190	9,445	9,700
Class 6	6,710	6,935	7,160	7,385	7,610	7,835	8,060	8,285	8,510	8,735
Class 7	6,205	6,410	6,615	6,820	7,025	7,230	7,435	7,640	7,845	8,050
Class 8	5,490	5,675	5,860	6,045	6,230	6,415	6,600	6,785	6,970	7,155
Class 9	5,010	5,175	5,340	5,505	5,670	5,835	6,000	6,165	6,330	6,495
Class 10	4,480	4,630	4,780	4,930	5,080	5,230	5,380	5,530	5,680	5,830'.

"SEC. 121. Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

"Agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees

"SEC. 122. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102 of this Act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

"Miscellaneous provisions

"SEC. 123. Section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 1173) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) The rate of basic compensation, established under this section, and received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of a statutory increase in the compensation schedules of the salary systems specified in subsection (a) shall be initially adjusted on the effective date of such new compensation schedules in accordance with conversion rules and regulations prescribed by the President or by such agency or agencies as he may designate.'

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"Absorption of costs

"SEC. 124. (a) The cost of not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate amount of the increases in compensation provided by this title for the fiscal year 1965 shall be absorbed by the departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch; and no amount beyond the additional sum for such compensation increases proposed in the budget for the fiscal year 1965 is authorized to be appropriated by any provision of this Act. The total amount of such absorption shall be allocated by the Bureau of the Budget among such departments, agencies, estblishments, and corporations in such manner and to such extent as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget deems appropriate in the light of their essential functions.

"(b) Pursuant to the objective of this section, heads of the executive branch activities concerned are directed to review with meticulous care each vacancy resulting from voluntary resignation, retirement, or death and to determine whether the duties of the position can be reassigned to other employees or whether the position can be abolished without seriously affecting the execution of essential functions.

"(c) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be held or considered to require (1) the separation from the service of any individual by reduction in force or other personnel action or (2) the placing of any individual in a leave-without-pay status."

Mr. MURRAY (during the reading of the amendment.) Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment reduces the cost of this bill by approximately $123 million by eliminating the "frills" added in committee although strongly opposed by the administration, by correcting a deficiency in payroll operations, and by requiring absorption of 10 percent of the cost.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the Chair whether or not there are any committee prints of this amendment available so that Members might be able to know what it contains.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot inform the gentleman as to that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to inquire whether or not committee prints are available of this amendment which, as I understand it, is a substitute for title I of the bill. Are copies available for distribution among the Members of the House so that they may know what it contains? I have been told at the desk here that there is only one committee print available. I would be happy to look at that copy but I believe other Members should have an opportunity to see a copy of the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. I believe copies are available and can be obtained by any Member.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Where are they? Is anybody distributing copies of the amendment?

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Tennessee will yield further, I would like to state I feel the minority Members of the House should be just as much entitled to read this amendment as the majority Members. I want to insist, if I may, that copies of this amendment should be available for distribution to Members so that they may know what is in the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. There are copies, I believe, at the desk on each side that are available for every Member.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. There are no copies here, at the back, or there in the front. Can we clear this up and possibly have copies distributed? We can follow the presentation better if we have them. There is only a single copy.

Let us have the record clear. Were copies made up, or is this just a statement that they are around? Does the majority have copies? Does anyone over there have copies? We have none, except the single one at the desk.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON. I believe the gentleman can call a page and get copies on that side or on this side. There were copies put in the back for both the majority and the minority.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield further, in this colloquy?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I say to the gentleman that is exactly what we have done. We have checked. There are not copies available. Who is handling this? Why can this not be taken care of? Who is in charge of this, for heaven's sake? Who is handling the bill? Copies obviously were printed. Here is the one copy we have on this side of the aisle. There are none in the back. We have just checked. Can we get this clarified? Who is in charge here?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I will explain the amendment, I hope to the satisfaction of all.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to say, if the gentleman will yield further, that this is about 30 pages. Without copies available I believe possibly a recess will be in order.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. The gentleman from Tennessee had the floor, and I have not heard him yield to any Member lately. He is not standing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] has been recognized by the Chair. We hope the gentleman from Tennessee will maintain his position standing, if he wishes to obtain the attention of the Chamber.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Chairman. I shall do so.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the cost of this bill by approximately $123 million by eliminating costly "frills" added in committee although strongly opposed by the administration, by correcting a deficiency in payroll operations, and by requiring absorption of 10 percent of the cost.

First, the amendment strikes out section 114(e), which would grant step increases for postal employees in the first six levels on the basis of total postal service. This will save $46.5 million.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio wishes to make a point of order.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. It is absolutely impossible to hear or understand what the gentleman is saying. If the gentleman is trying to put the explanation in place of a copy of the amendment, this is certainly a strange way to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The Chair once again appeals to the Members to please desist from audible conversation. Those Members standing in the aisles will take seats or retire to the cloakrooms. The gentleman is entitled to be heard in the explanation of his amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, second, the amendment strikes out section 114(b), which would unduly accelerate automatic step increases for postal employees in salary levels 7 and above. This will save $1.9 million.

Third, the amendment strikes out subsections (c) and (d) of section 114 which would put postmasters on a 5-day workweek. This will save at least $6.7 million.

Fourth, the amendment adds a new section 103(a) to correct a deficiency in payroll operations for hourly and pay-period salary calculations by providing that fractions of a cent be rounded to the nearest cent instead of being curried to the next higher cent as at present. This will save $10 million a year.

Fifth, the amendment adds a new section 124 which requires all executive departments and agencies to absorb 10 percent of the cost of their salary increases from their budgets presented by the President and forbids any supplemental requests for funds to cover the cost of their pay raises. This will save $57.8 million.

The adoption of these amendments will bring this bill into conformity with the policy of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. I urge approval of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder if the gentleman, as the ranking minority member of the committee, is able to enlighten us as to the availability of any copies of these amendments.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. CORBETT. I might say to the gentleman that while I did not even know there was one printed copy, the committee has been called and they are trying to round up any copies that do exist. However, my understanding of the amending process here in the Committee of the Whole is that it simply means the amendment has to be written, and it is only required to have one copy available at the desk. I know it would be more convenient to have a full copy, but particularly for the benefit of the Member, who is a hard working member of the committee, I would advise or suggest that a copy be handed to him, so he could read it.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I suggest that the Members of the House are entitled to the opportunity of knowing what is in an amendment as broad and sweeping as this is. May I make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CORBETT. I was going to try to explain the amendment a little bit, but the gentleman is using up all my time. Go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would a motion that the Committee rise be in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania yields for that purpose.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. I probably only have 3 minutes left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania refuses to yield further. The Committee will be in order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I might say that this amendment was presented to the Committee on Rules. It was discussed there at some length. It in effect takes out of the title all of those amendments which we in the committee referred to as "goodie" amendments, that is, the things which did increase the compensation or the fringe benefits of the employees but did not in any way affect the salary schedule. This amendment, as I understand it, leaves the salary features of title I exactly as they are in the bill reported. It only takes out in a group all of these side benefits that might have been included. For example, the Dulski amendment, which might have cost in the neighborhood of $43 million, is eliminated by this amendment. The 5-day week for postmasters is eliminated, and so on and so forth.

In the interest of trying to get the total cost of the bill back to the amount of money budgeted for the coming fiscal year, this amendment—that is, title I—was prepared and numerous members of the committee, whether they did or did not favor the passage of individual amendments in committee, decided that they should support the Murray amendment to title I, and then, if these things, these other matters, were desirable, they ought to be included in legislation at some other time.

With the passage of this amendment we maintain identically the comparability features as set up in the original reported bill. We eliminate all of the fringe benefits. We cut the total cost of the bill back from in the neighborhood of $668 million to around $545 million. This is a good amendment for those who want to economize and for those who want to be fiscally responsible and for those who want to keep within the budget limitation. This amendment should be passed.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, in order to cut down some of the confusion that some are trying to generate here, I should like to say this, and I think it is very simple. I have been here 21 years and I have seen hundreds and hundreds of amendments offered and there were no printed copies for Members. The proper procedure is to send the amendment to the desk and the clerk reads the amendment. The Member then explains his amendment and I believe our chairman and other members of the committee can fully explain same. There are some people here who are in such a big rush, they do not seem to want to have the amendment explained. This is just a simple amendment. It cuts down the cost of this bill. I want to ask the gentleman from Arizona, who is familiar with this matter, and is the author of one of the bills, if this amendment does not cut out of the bill $123 million and reduce the total cost of the bill to $545 million, which is within $1 million of the President's budget request? Is that correct?

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is exactly correct. Much of the outcry from those who are demanding a copy of this 31-page amendment, comes from people who are opposed to the original bill. I suspect they will be opposed to the bill after the amendment is adopted. And I suppose they will still be opposed to the bill whether or not we amend it or change it in any other fashion.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Just a short observation in order to clarify the record, if the gentleman please. I understand—I was not there—but I understand that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] for whom I have a great regard, as I do for other members of that committee, did present this amendment in testimony before the Committee on Rules on Wednesday of last week. At that time the amendment seemed to have been at least in typewritten form. So I do not believe it is so peculiar or so strange that some of us would like to have had the opportunity of seeing a printed copy of this very important amendment today. I do believe there was plenty of time to have the amendment printed. I hope that explains the situation and clarifies the atmosphere, for the benefit of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] who seems to have been disturbed by my inquiry.

Mr. UDALL. There has been considerable conversation about economy in recent months and because of that situation we had only 100 copies of the amendment printed. That is about 98 copies more than the number ordinarily printed of amendments which are sent to the desk.

Mr. Chairman, let me try to explain briefly what this amendment is, and then if I have any time I shall yield. The bill has five titles. We are now starting with the first title. The chairman of our committee has offered a rewrite of that first title. But it does not rewrite very much of it. It is in technical language, and the simplest way to rewrite the small portion involved was simply to rewrite the whole title and offer it as a substitute. The title covers the classified service. It covers the postal employees and postmasters. It covers the Veterans' Administration's various schedules in medicine and surgery and other employees. It covers the Foreign Service schedule and the ASCS employees. None of these major salary systems are affected in any way by this substitute amendment. It does not affect the Veterans' Administration, the Foreign Service, the ASCS. The schedules for the postal and classified system are exactly word for word and line for line and figure for figure the same ones you have in the basic bill before you.

As has been said already, and I thought there would be great enthusiasm for it, all it does is to cut off $123 million of the cost and bring it down within the ball park so we will have a cost which has been fully budgeted in the 1964 budget and will be budgeted in the 1965 budget.

The three major things that this does—and the Chairman covered this—the three major savings are first, in some fringe benefits, the so-called Dulski amendment which, when it was presented to the committee, we thought had a very modest price tag, but it turns out that it has a price tag anywhere from $45 to $55 million. This is eliminated by the substitute, and in my judgment it should have been eliminated.

Second—and this was touched on yesterday—there is a provision which will require the rounding out of any pay raises down to the nearest whole cent. This will save about $10 million.

The third major change—and this is the most important—requires, in a straightforward, rigid, mandatory fashion, that each department which has employees entitled to this raise must absorb 10 percent of the cost. It is binding language. They are bound to absorb 10 percent of the cost. Ten percent of the cost of $540 million is something over $50 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. This mandate, incidentally, if the Congress passes it today is going to strengthen the hand of the budget which will attempt to keep these agencies in line. In other words, they will be able to point to a mandate we have adopted which requires that 10 percent of the cost of this bill be absorbed.

Mr. Chairman, during the hearings on the 1962 pay raise we had testimony to the effect that 42 percent of the cost was absorbed by the agencies. This can be done and it will be done.

Mr. Chairman, while I am speaking, permit me to make one other point. If you have a Government contract for $100 million, all of this money goes out. We may get back eventually from the taxpayers some of this amount in the form of income tax return. However, the bill before us deals only with Federal employees and if a person receives a $100 pay raise, he will never see $20 of that $100. It will be withheld and never leave the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to reduce the cost of this bill to the extent of $145 million if this substitute amendment is adopted.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. That is the sort of question I wanted to ask. As I understand it, the original bill provided for $600 million, and you are going to reduce that $123 or $125 million.

How do you wind up with $544 million? Why do you not wind up with $476 or $478 million?

Mr. UDALL. I have the figure sheet here at the desk.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. The original cost of the bill was $668 million.

Mr. WESTLAND. That is not what the report shows.

Mr. UDALL. The report is on a bill which was reported last November. The bill at that time had a different cost.

Mr. WESTLAND. This report on the bill H.R. 8986, page 3, says the cost of the bill is $600.7 million.

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER] to explain that.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I do not have the report in front of me, but I have the cost sheet which shows the original administration bill cost was $566 million. Then the committee bill, H.R. 8986, came out with $668.5 million, and with the Murray amendment it comes to $545.7 million.

Mr. UDALL. Yes; $123 million comes off.

Mr. WESTLAND. You ought to have your report corrected, because the report does not show that at all.

Mr. UDALL. I do not think there is any error in the report.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. To clarify the difference, the report has figures based upon 1962 employment figures and the information given now by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is based on 1963 employment figures.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman should be complimented for clarifying some of the questions involved. There are two unanswered questions I would like to have reemphasized and answered. First, in what other parts of the report are there figures that are in need of adjustment? Second, will the gentleman please explain to the membership how the majority of the committee was so overliberal in overloading the original administration bill?

Mr. UDALL. I reject the gentleman's suggestion that the report is filled with inaccuracies. It is not. It is a good report, and it is accurate. It is based on figures we had when we reported the bill last November. We had some delay in getting this bill to the floor. But Government goes on, employment changes, and there have been salary adjustments come into play, promotions, and things of that kind. So I reject the thought there are any great number of inaccuracies in the report. I think it is a good report, and I recommend it for the reading of the Members of the House.

The gentleman wants to know why we reduced the cost of the bill. It was because we wanted economy, we wanted to bring this bill within the budget figures. This is not an addition to the budget. The bill will be within the 1964 budget of President Kennedy and within the 1964 budget of President Johnson.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The question I asked the gentleman was why in committee we added the $123 million that we are now scaling down.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman was a member of the committee. He did not want to add anything, as I recall. He was against all raises for postal employees, classified officials, Members of Congress, and everyone else. This is my recollection.

(Mr. CHELF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, recently I have voted against the $4 billion foreign aid—the $312 million additional lending authority for the International Aid Administration, which is foreign aid under a different woodshed—and what I consider to be other unnecessary Federal spending programs. I did this in order to help keep and to maintain a balanced budget and, therefore, justify the tax cut that I vigorously supported as far back as the late 1950's. I did so because I felt our people and American business desperately needed such an incentive in order to grow, develop, and expand their plants, which in turn would create more jobs and more prosperity.

In the last few days unprecedented rains have whipped up swirling, angry floodwaters that have greatly damaged and even destroyed several of my cities. For instance, the entire population of West Point, Hardin County, Ky., lying on the Ohio River near Louisville, has had to be evacuated completely. Shepherdsville, in Bullitt County, also near Louisville, is two-thirds under water. This happened notwithstanding the fact that recently the good citizens there, working with their Congressman, the Army engineers, and the commanding general at Fort Knox, had caused Salt River to be cleared, cleaned, dredged, and its channel improved. It had been thought by the Army engineers that this recent job on Salt River would alleviate future floods. However, a rainfall of 6.3 inches, all within several hours, had not been anticipated. Northern Kentucky is in horrible condition. Campbell, Kenton, and Boone Counties are inundated. Hundreds of families have been evacuated. The cities of Covington, Newport, Ludlow, Fort Thomas, Dayton, and many others are under water.

In view of the present suffering, misery, and privation that some of my people are being subjected to, I cannot vote for this pay increase. While I cannot vote for this bill, I want the RECORD to show that for the past 20 years that I have been in this body, I have been a friend of the Federal employee, because I have consistently voted for all pay raises for all of our fine Federal and postal workers including our Supreme Court judges, Federal judges, Cabinet members, ambassadors, and others.

While I agree with the proponents of this legislation who have made such a long and hard study of it, that there is a need for a fair equitable, moderate and general pay raise for Federal employees; however, due to the horrible and tragic conditions that exist in my district at this time, I cannot in good conscience support this particular piece of legislation.

The good Lord knows that the Fourth District of Kentucky could surely use some of that foreign aid money now being sent to countries overseas, that is to be given to people we do not know, will never see, and who care nothing about us, while our very own suffer from want and neglect.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CUNNINGHAM to the amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY. On page 18 of the committee print, dated March 5, 1964, of the amendment offered by Mr. Murray, insert "(a)" immediately following "SEC. 109." in line 7 and immediately below the table on page 18 insert the following:

"(b) (1) Section 3515 of title 39, United States Code, relating to positions in salary level 4 of the Postal Field Service Schedule, is amended by inserting at the end of such section the following subsection:

"'(e) Mail handler. (KP-13)

"'(1) BASIC FUNCTION.—Loads, unloads, and moves bulk mail, and performs other duties incidental to the movement and processing of mail

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"'(2) Duties and responsibilities.—

"'(A) Unloads mail received by trucks. Separates all mail received by trucks and conveyors for subsequent dispatch to other conveying units, and separates and delivers working mails for delivery to distribution areas.

"'(B) Places empty sacks or pouches on racks, labels them where labels are prearranged or racks are plainly marked, dumps mail from sacks, cuts, ties, faces letter mail, carries mail to distributors for processing, places processed mail into sacks, removes filled sacks and pouches from racks, closes and locks same. Picks up sacks, pouches and outside pieces, separates outgoing bulk mails for dispatch and loads mail onto trucks.

"'(C) Handles and sacks empty equipment, inspects empty equipment for mail content, restrings sacks.

"'(D) Cancels stamps on parcel post, operates canceling machines, carries mail from canceling machine to distribution cases.

"'(E) Assists in supply and slip rooms and operates addressograph, mimeograph, and similar machines.

"'(F) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"'(i) Acts as armed guard for valuable registry shipments and as watchman and guard around post office building.

"'(ii) Makes occasional simple distribution of parcel post mail requiring no scheme knowledge.

"'(iii) Operates electric fork-lift trucks.

"'(iv) Rewraps soiled or broken parcels.

"'(v) Performs other miscellaneous duties, such as stamping tickets, weighing incoming sacks, cleaning and sweeping in workrooms, offices, and trucks where such work is not performed by regular cleaners.

"'(3) Organizational relationships.—Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.'

"(2) Section 3514 of title 39, United States Code, relating to positions in salary level 3 of the Postal Field Service Schedule, is amended—

"(A) by striking out subsection (d), relating to the position of mail handler (KP–8); and

"(B) by striking out

"'(e) Garageman. KP–9).'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'(e) Garageman. (KP–8).'

"(3) Section 3515 of title 39, United States Code, is further amended by striking out '(KP–10)', '(KP–11)', '(KP–12)', and '(KP–13)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(KP–9)', '(KP–10)', '(KP–11)', and '(KP–12)', respectively.

"(4) Each employee in the position of mail handler on the effective date of this subsection, which is moved from level 3 to 4 of the Postal Field Service Schedule by reason of the amendments made by this subsection, shall be placed in that step of such level 4 having the lowest basic compensation which is higher than his basic compensation immediately prior to such effective date and shall retain all his service credit for automatic advancement by step-increases in such level 4 under and in accordance with section 3552 of title 39, United States Code, relating to automatic advancement by step-increases."

Mr. WALLHAUSER (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, simply for a comment on procedure?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. Before us now is this substitute amendment. For the convenience of the House, if amendments are made to the substitute, which was printed ahead of time, most such amendments are not printed ahead of time. I think this explains why there was concern on this side why the substitute was not available.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, although this amendment, which was carefully prepared, takes up about 4½ pages, it is relatively simple. Those Members who are not on the committee may not be familiar with the various classifications among the postal employees or the various grades in which individuals work. However, there is a classification which involves what are commonly known as mail handlers. They are in level 3. The post office clerks are in level 4, for example.

The mail handlers perform many duties that are similar to those performed by the post office clerks. I do not want to take anything away from the dedicated work that the post office clerks do, but I have gone into this carefully and I have visited post offices. In modern times the duties between the mail handlers in level 3 and the clerks in level 4 are more and more being fused together. Therefore, the people who are known as mail handlers feel they should be placed in level 4 because they perform so many side-by-side duties with the post office clerks who are already in this level.

Before the unanimous consent was granted, the details of all the work that the members of the mail handlers perform was partially explained. But they have many more duties. They cancel stamps and handle parcel post and operate canceling machines and carry mail from the canceling machines to the disposition cases. They assist the supplying slip rooms and operate various machinery. There are just many, many things that this group of dedicated people do. They are not a large number. They are a relatively small group when you consider the overall number of postal employees. Some people think that all they do is throw the mail sacks around from the truck to the platform or vice versa. But if you will go into the work that they are doing as I have and as other Members have, you will realize they have many diverse duties and, in my opinion, they should be placed in level 4. I am always honest and frank with Members of the House and with members of this committee. I did offer this in the committee when this bill was under consideration and it did not prevail. But at that time we were rushing through amendments right and left, and I feel confident that enough time was not granted for a thorough discussion of the plight of the mail handlers. I would hope very much that the committee would favorably consider this. As I said, it does not involve many people and I do think it is an act of justice to put them in level 4.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I think, Mr. Chairman, the record should be made very clear that the gentleman from Nebraska has been a constant champion of this group of dedicated employees and I think the gentleman should be commended for it. He has done his utmost to correct what he believes to be an inequity. Perhaps in the future some legislative relief should be given to this group. I would like to add my word of commendation to those of others on our committee who have observed the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska over the years, constantly trying to improve their status.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. CEDERBERG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this salary increase legislation because I believe it is inconsistent to increase Government payrolls over $500 million at a time when the Federal Government anticipates a deficit of $10 billion this fiscal year, and we will be requested to increase the national debt to over $315 billion in June.

The pay raise suggested for Members of Congress is certainly excessive. If the Congress would take the actions necessary to hold down spending and balance the budget, then consideration of a congressional pay increase might be in order. Federal payroll costs have increased almost $1 billion in the past 18 months. It seems inconsistent to me to ask unions and private industry to hold the wage/price line and at the same time have the Federal Government increase its payroll costs so substantially.

I consider the most pressing domestic need at this time is for the Federal Government to put its financial house in order. I intend to do what I can to assist in this problem.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will it be in order to offer an amendment to the pending substitute amendment following the disposition of the Cunningham amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, amendments will be in order at that time.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly in sympathy with my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Nebraska, about these particular people. But this amendment will add to the cost of this bill. I think our committee can work out a satisfactory solution at a later date. By chang-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ing one level to another level, the amendment will add approximately $400 more to the salary of each employee in this particular group, on top of what they already will get under the new salary schedule. This would be a discrimination against all the other Federal employees. It will destroy the proper relationships between the various salary levels.

Mr. Chairman, not only was this amendment voted down when our committee considered this bill, but it had been voted down at a previous time. This amendment, as I have said, Mr. Chairman, would destroy the relationship of the wage scales in the levels that are referred to in the gentleman's amendment.

I urge the Members in the Committee of the Whole to reflect upon the action of our committee, which went over this not once but twice and voted it down both times. It does not belong in this bill. It should not be in this bill. It would add considerably to the cost of the bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman is quite forceful in all his arguments. I compliment him. I agree with him on many occasions, but I cannot subscribe to what the gentleman has said so far as cost is concerned.

I should like to reduce the cost, also, but there is a principle involved. I am hopeful that we can approve this. As I said, considering the overall employment in the postal service, this is one of the smallest groups. I think it would not add any significant cost whatsoever.

I make the further observation to the gentleman from Louisiana that the amendment was not given the careful consideration it should have been given. I happen to know that committee prints were developed overnight and the committee had only about 2 seconds to develop this subject the next morning.

I hope the gentleman will not try to knock down every constructive amendment which is offered.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

It is a matter of opinion as to what the committee did. Some Members believe the committee considered it carefully. Others take a different viewpoint.

This is simple arithmetic. When we consider the tens of thousands of employees, if we add $400 to each salary we see what we will come up with for the salaries for a year. That is all it amounts to.

This amendment would not help the bill, nor should it be in the bill. As I say, it was voted down by the full committee not once but on two occasions, after full consideration.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] has raised the point—and I believe he is in order in doing so—that his amendment was considered during a period of rush in the committee, under the pressure of time and with limited consideration in debate, I should like to comment further on that practice.

I share the concern of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] over the lack of availability of the copies of the committee amendment, which has been offered. I assure the gentleman, however, in extending my sympathies, that we who serve on the committee are not unfamiliar with the problem. When there is proposed legislation before us in committee, we frequently have it presented to us at the time we meet to consider it and then have a motion for the previous question and a railroading operation. I say on the floor of the House that this has become standard operating procedure in this committee. I go further and say that there would not be the necessity for this kind of amending process on the floor of this House if the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service had been permitted, by the majority of its membership, to perform in an orderly fashion and with an opportunity to give full consideration to amendments that were presented.

I say further, for the benefit of my good friend from Louisiana, he may regard this allegation as a matter of opinion, but I regard it as a matter of fact. I am sure there are a number of members of the committee who will corroborate that view.

Let me just add one further point. I note with interest from the statements of my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], that the limitation on the number of copies of this amendment was voted in the interest of economy. Let me say it seems to be the general practice of this administration, whenever they do indulge in economy, to involve in some way turning the lights out. So today we have the lights down to dim in respect to the number of copies of this amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Yes. I will yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is a very valuable and very knowledgeable and important member of this committee. Does he mean to leave the impression that if he wanted a copy of this amendment, which has been available for over a week, that our fine committee staff would not have given it to him yesterday, last night, or today?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I want to leave the impression that the Members of this House who wanted copies of it this morning were evidently not able to get them at the time that they needed them.

Mr. UDALL. Did not the gentleman have a copy before this morning?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I did not.

Mr. UDALL. Did he ask for it?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I did not.

Let me make one final observation. Let me say in response to the gentleman that whether the gentleman from Michigan did or did not ask for a copy has no bearing on whether copies were available to the Members of the House who did desire them. It is obvious they were not available.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Yes. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. You would have thought the minority members of the committee would have been supplied with copies of the gentleman's amendment since it revised almost half of the 76-page bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Of course. And I would have thought also there might have been an opportunity for the committee to meet and consider the amendment and be familiarized with it before it was brought to the floor of this House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively simple amendment, we are told. It is so simple that it requires 36 pages. The first time I saw it was about 10 minutes ago. It revamps almost half of the total bill of 76 pages, but it is still described as a relatively simple amendment. As I understand it, the minority members of the committee—and I cannot speak for the first ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], but as far as I am concerned, I have never seen a copy of this, and I do not think that any other members of the minority, unless they are in on the so-called strategy that goes on within the committee, saw this amendment until this morning. This is the "less worse, cornеon amendment,' this amendment that has been offered by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]. You know, it intrigues me to see all of these new-found advocates of economy that we are hearing from today. I do not know where they were last fall when the committee prints were coming in at the rate of one overnight for 3 or 4 days when this bill was being handled in the committee. Yes, I am intrigued by all of these converts to economy. I wonder what they were thinking about last fall, last November, when this bill came out. Were they advocates of economy then? They offer this sop today for an alleged saving of $120 million and still leave a total expenditure of $550 million. I see the gentleman from Washington who questioned some of the figures in the majority report a little while ago. I will say to the gentleman that I think if he wants the pure quill on this bill, he should turn to the minority report. There he will get the figures that tell the story on this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I support the Murray amendment. I think it is a step in the right direction. I just hope that the Committee will also support this amendment that I have just offered to help the really destitute people, the mail handlers, and put them where they should be put, in level 4.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Murray amendment. It is a snare

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

and a delusion. It is not economy in the true sense of the word, and everyone who supports it knows it. This offer of a reduction in total spending on this bill is made for the purpose of securing votes. If I know the taxpayers of this country, they will see through this attempt to take $5 from them and give them back $1 and call it economy. That is about the story when only $100 million is cut from a proposed expenditure of $500 million.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, quite obviously this bill is highly technical and has a tendency within itself to become somewhat confusing. I would like to attempt in my feeble way to put this problem again somewhat in its proper perspective, even though I realize that it has been thoroughly and effectively discussed on yesterday. But we have a tendency here to dramatize certain features of it, to emphasize the cost and make it appear that we are voting on a simple question as to whether we are to have increased spending or an unbalanced budget, or whether you are for or against fiscal integrity. I feel, frankly, that is oversimplification.

This bill within itself is not the one that necessitates an increase in cost. It is because of inflation and the increased cost of living in the past that makes this bill by the committee necessary. It is an action by Congress to have all these vast programs costing in the neighborhood of $98 to $100 billion a year that necessitates this cost. I think we should put this very clearly in the proper perspective.

The main objective of this bill is comparability. I said the main objective—99 percent of it, any way. Is there any Member of this body who has had any experience in business or in management who thinks that it is unnecessary that we pay technicians, scientists, engineers in the Federal Government comparable salaries with those paid their counterparts in free enterprise? I should not think that particular objective of this legislation would be at all controversial.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. The point has been made several times that the Congress has put one pay raise on top of another pay raise, on top of another pay raise, and so forth. Is it the opinion of the gentleman from Virginia that this is an added pay raise, or is it his opinion that the employees started from away behind scratch originally, that these pay raises that have been given have slowly tended to bring them up finally to comparability? Is that correct or not?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The gentleman has stated the position of the gentleman from Virginia; he is absolutely correct, yes. Federal employees have always been the caboose, or the tail that wags the dog. We have always been trying to catch up, so far as the pay of Federal employees is concerned, as compared to wages in private industry. The Congress did recognize that this was a problem and that something should be done, in the act of 1962.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Does this pay raise put them ahead of private enterprise in salaries and wages?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. It most certainly does not, because we authorized this study and directed this report back in 1962. At that time they were using, I believe, comparable figures for 1961.

Mr. Chairman, when the committee considered this legislation last year we were already 2 years behind on the figures which we were using. On top of that, we compromised some of the figures. We are doing that right now. In other words, we are about a year and a half or 2 years behind in comparable positions in free enterprise; that is, what these people holding comparable positions in free enterprise are receiving.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot ignore this. This is bad management and we must recognize the facts of life.

Mr. Chairman, we have discussed at quite some length the various positions in the executive branch of Government. This report and study is available. The only think which the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service has done is to accept the results of that report.

Mr. Chairman, we are paying out this fiscal year approximately $184 million in contracts on which we have 11,469 individuals working for the Federal Government on those contracts. The salaries which these people are receiving far exceed that which we have allowed Federal employees under the Classification Act.

Mr. Chairman, on some of these outside Government contracts we have some individuals who are making as high as $40,000 a year, more than the members of the Supreme Court receive. This figure is far in excess of that which is allowed in this particular bill. We have 20 people alone in the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy who are receiving $27,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, the point is that we have not faced up to our responsibilities to bring about comparability in the salaries and wages which are paid in the Federal Government for comparable work performed by Federal employees. Mr. Chairman, we have this responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CUNNINGHAM) there were—ayes 4, noes 55.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DULSKI

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DULSKI to the amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: Amend section 114 by inserting "(a)" immediately following "SEC. 114." and by adding three new subsections, as follows:

"(b) Section 3541(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by—

"(1) striking out 'postmasters,' in paragraph (3) thereof; and

"(2) adding immediately following paragraph (5) thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(6) To compute the daily rate of basic compensation for postmasters, the annual rate of compensation shall be divided by 260.'

"(c) Chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"'§ 3577. Postmasters

"'Postmasters shall be scheduled to work a five-day week except upon determination by the Postmaster General that a workweek in excess of five days for the postmaster of a particular post office is necessary to maintain essential postal service in the public interest. The provisions of this section shall not be applied to require the closing of any post office on any weekday, Monday through Saturday.'

"(d) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting

"'3577. Postmasters.'

immediately below

"'3576. Holiday service of rural carriers and employees assigned to road duty.'"

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, yesterday in our deliberations I discussed the Murray amendment. The Murray amendment strikes out two important sections of the entire bill.

The first section takes away the inequities of Public Law 87–793 that was adopted and known as the Payroll Reform Act of 1962. The other portion of the bill removes the 40-hour week that was passed in our committee for the postmasters of the United States.

In the United States there are slightly more than 34,000 postmasters. They are managers in the field of our vast postal system which is a most important segment of the communications complex existing in our country today.

Industry could not thrive nor prosper without it and the well-being of both the individual and family depend upon it.

Post offices serving the villages and small localities are known as of the fourth class. We find that there are 10,362 of these faithfully serving the people in every area and corner of our Nation today.

Postmasters at these small offices have no clerical assistance whatever except for special occasions such as annual, or sick leave or convention attendance.

This is the person who arrives at his post of duty early in the morning, hangs out the flag, receives the mail, sweeps the floor, sells stamps, issues money orders, weighs up the parcel post, takes care of general delivery patrons, sorts and dispatches the mail usually at the end of the day. Under present law, this postmaster is scheduled 6 days a week and frequently he is expected by patrons to come down to the office on Sundays.

Post offices at the larger towns and cities are known as Presidential offices

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

and comprise what is known as the first, second, and third class.

Of the 24,000 postmasters in this group, 14,000 in the third class and the smaller second class, have neither an assistant postmaster nor an assistant to the postmaster. However, these offices generally speaking have qualified personnel for replacement of the postmaster on Saturday if an allowance therefor is granted.

President Johnson has gone on record in favor of this. Here you have a Government agency still working people 6 or 7 days a week.

The 10,000 postmasters in the larger towns and cities have no problem for 5-day-a-week privileges as qualified assistance is available.

Other postal employees for two decades have enjoyed a 40-hour, 5-day week. They are paid overtime and are granted compensatory time. We ask for neither of these benefits for postmasters. We only want a decent 5-day week established by law.

The 5-day workweek provided in H.R. 8986 corrects an inequity not of this year or last year or the year before; it is an inequity for many years.

This would be accomplished at a cost of less than $7 million which, we submit, is very small, indeed, compared to a postal budget of more than $4 billion and an estimated cost of approximately $600 million for H.R. 8986.

These dedicated servants of the people should have a prescribed decent weekly tour of duty. The 5-day week is maintained all through the Government service and the postmasters deserve equivalent treatment.

We are progressing in all fields of communications, such as, for instance, the projected trip to the moon.

Postmasters should be included in the modern conception of duty requirements. It is archiac to maintain a 6-day week for these faithful employees of the Government.

I would like to place in the RECORD the following letter which was sent to Chairman MURRAY of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on October 30, 1964:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been informed that your committee has under consideration an amendment to the Federal salary bill which will provide for most postmasters to be scheduled on a 5-day per week basis. I concur and endorse such a proposal since a 5-day, 40-hour week has become fairly common in the U.S. business economy and the Federal Government. In fact, we had planned to institute this program by administrative action on July 1, 1964, with the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget. Therefore, we have no objection to such action being authorized by statute.

The estimated cost of the proposed action will be about $6.7 million per annum. In my opinion the language as proposed provides sufficient flexibility to schedule most postmasters regularly on a 5-day, 40-hour workweek and still maintain essential service 6 days a week.

You might be interested to know that during the past year we have modified previous regulations to extend to postmasters time off on Saturday without charge to leave for emergency reasons, while at the same time making arrangements to keep the post offices open.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, postmasters' salaries under the present law are based on 312 workdays per year—6 days per week. Mr. DULSKI's amendment would base postmasters' salaries on 260 workdays per year—5 days per week.

Postmasters in larger offices who have assistant postmasters or other supervisors, or enough clerical replacement, can take Saturdays off under present regulations. However, approximately 17,000 postmasters in smaller communities do not have adequate clerical replacement and therefore are required to work 6 days per week, 8 hours or more per day.

Postmaster General Gronouski, in a letter to the gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman TOM MURRAY, of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, last October endorsed the 5-day workweek for postmasters. He estimated the cost of the amendment at $6.7 million per year. That money would not go to postmasters, but rather would go to the lowest paid employees in the postal service—namely, clerks in the third- and fourth-class offices, some of whom work as little as 12 or 14 hours per week. This amendment would give them an average of 4 hours per week more employment.

I support the Dulski amendment to the Murray amendment.

The Morrison salary bill is the original Kennedy comparability bill. This amendment to put all postmasters on a 5-day week or 5-day, 40-hour week is only catchup legislation to make the workweek of postmasters comparable to the workweek of all employees in the postal field service.

All postmasters are responsible for the efficient operation of their offices, the safeguarding of mail, and the safeguarding of postal property on a 24-hour per day basis, 7 days a week. As managers of the individual post offices and as Government officials, they are not asking under this amendment to be relieved of that responsibility. The wording of the amendment provides sufficient flexibility so that postmasters in times of emergency, or in certain periods when the mails are exceptionally heavy, can work more than 5 days and more than 40 hours each week without being paid overtime or compensatory time. Postmasters do not request compensatory time or overtime pay when requirements of the service necessitate their presence in their offices. This amendment merely makes it possible under normal conditions for postmasters to be scheduled to work a 5-day workweek or 40-hour workweek.

The National Association of Postmasters, under the able leadership of Charles Pushkar, their secretary-treasurer, have presented a good case for the 5-day week. I urge support of the Dulski amendment to the Murray amendment.

I include the letter of the Postmaster General to the gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman TOM MURRAY, recommending the 5-day week for postmasters:

POSTMASTER GENERAL JOHN A. GRONOUSKI ENDORSES 5-DAY WORKWEEK FOR POSTMASTERS

We are grateful to Postmaster General Gronouski for endorsing the NAPUS amendment to the salary bill. On October 30 he sent the following letter to Chairman TOM MURRAY of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been informed that your committee has under consideration an amendment to the Federal salary bill which will provide for most postmasters to be scheduled on a 5-day per week basis. I concur and endorse such a proposal since a 5-day, 40-hour week has become fairly common in the U.S. business economy and the Federal Government. In fact, we had planned to institute this program by administrative action on July 1, 1964, with the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget. Therefore, we have no objection to such action being authorized by statute.

"The estimated cost of the proposed action will be about $6.7 million per annum. In my opinion the language as proposed provides sufficient flexibility to schedule most postmasters regularly on a 5-day, 40-hour workweek and still maintain essential service 6 days a week.

"You might be interested to know that during the past year we have modified previous regulations to extend to postmasters time off on Saturday without charge to leave for emergency reasons, while at the same time making arrangements to keep the post offices open.

"Sincerely yours,

"JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
"Postmaster General".

I must say in fairness that since the above-quoted letter the Postmaster General has issued a new estimate of cost of $20 million, and now opposes this 5-day-week proposal.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. Is this not a way of cutting the Murray amendment practically in half? In other words, the Murray amendment has savings of $123 million. This takes away at least $55 million of it. Therefore, the Murray amendment savings would be reduced from $123 million to $68 million and, instead of having this within the President's budget item of $544 million, it would raise the cost to over $600 million. Is that not right? If the proponents of this amendment have a very deserving position, I feel that our committee could work out a satisfactory solution at a later date.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is exactly correct. This is the principal reason why I oppose the amendment to the amendment which is now before us.

The gentleman from New York has spoken of the postmasters and some of the other groups that would be affected by his amendment. I think all of us are sympathetic toward the problems that they have, but this particular Dulski amendment was brought up in the com-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

mittee, and it passed by a vote of 12 to 11, as I recall, on a very sincere but misinformed representation at that time that the cost would be about $5 or $6 million. When we got through and started to make our recapitulation, it was determined that the first part of his amendment would increase the cost something in the range of $45 million, and the 5-day postmaster week, for which you can make a pretty logical argument, would cost $7 million, as he said, to start it, but to get it in effect and keep it in effect would be something in the range of $24 million a year. So to keep within the budget and to keep the agreement that we made with the Rules Committee and the Members of the House that we would bring in a bill that would be within the budget, the majority of the members of the committee are going to oppose this amendment.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. In our deliberations about the Dulski amendment, I think the cost was stated yesterday at $22 million.

Mr. UDALL. I do not recall the figure. The gentleman is a very valuable and sincere Member. I know he was as surprised as some of the rest of us were when the Department said the cost would be higher than he thought.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DULSKI) there were—ayes 19, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARRY

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRY to the amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: Page 24, line 3, strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Section 3552(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a)(1) Each employee of the Postal Field Service Schedule and each employee subject to the Rural Carrier Schedule who has not reached the highest step for his position shall be advanced successively to the next higher step as follows:

"'(A) To steps 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of fifty-two calendar weeks of satisfactory service; and

"'(B) To steps 8 and above—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completition of one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of satisfactory service.

"'(2) The receipt of an equivalent increase during any of the waiting periods specified in this subsection shall cause a new full waiting period to commence for further step increases.'"

Mr. BARRY (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, many of us who find it difficult to support the bill will only support the bill providing it is a forward step in management. Whereas there were many hearings on this bill last year and in previous years, and some of us have been giving support to the bill, we certainly do not want to adopt an amendment that has in it provisions that further throw out of line the very rule of comparability that the bill purports to do. In the House bill known as the salary reform act of 1962, postal employees progress through seven steps at 1-year intervals. When the Senate committee met, they reported a bill that did not include the extension of 1-year intervals beyond level 6 and due to the rush toward adjournment that year, in 1962, and the fact that the Senate bill was acted upon first, the 1-year interval was deleted for employees in levels 7 and higher, which consists mainly of postal supervisors and postmasters.

The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service realizing the inequities created by the 2-year step increase for some employees and 1-year step increases for all levels beyond level 6 put back the 1-year interval in the present bill that we have before us today.

The Murray amendment knocks that out and reverts back to the Senate provision of a 2-year step interval for level 7 and beyond.

Now I know this may sound like gobbledygook to all of you, but let me give you an example of what this does. A glance at this example will immediately disclose that an employee who advances at 1-year intervals lessens the salary differential between himself and his supervisor each year, which basically would not be fair. The differential between a supervisor and his employees is the small amount of $480 and would be reduced in 4 years to only $140 unless my amendment is adopted. If employee A in level 6 is promoted, for 4 years up to 1968, he advances to step 7 or level 7 at $7,150 which is $400 more than employee B who was promoted to level 7, 4 years earlier. Employee B will not reach step 7 until 1971. Now there is nothing fair about that.

So I say to you, if this bill is to have meaning and if this bill is, indeed, a forward step in management putting salaries on a comparability basis, I vigorously urge adoption of this amendment so that an employee working under a supervisor in 4 years' time does not reduce the spread from $480 to $140.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman places me in a very embarrassing position. I have been opposing amendments all morning trying to keep the bill down to the budgeted figure. I sponsored this particular amendment in the original legislation that was presented to our committee. The cost of this amendment is about $2 million.

Mr. BARRY. It would be nearer $1,800,000.

Mr. UDALL. That is correct. The cost of this amendment would be $1.8 million. In my judgment, this is a good amendment. However, to be fully consistent with the position that I have been taking here this morning would embarrass me a little bit. I want to emphasize I speak only for myself and I know that the majority of the committee on this side at least are probably going to oppose the amendment. However, there is an inequity here and the gentleman by his amendment has put his finger on it.

Mr. BARRY. I thank the gentleman and I realize the position he is in.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I want to compliment the gentleman from New York. He is a dedicated, hard working member of the committee. He has explained his amendment with great clarity and I would hope that the leadership on the other side will not close their ears to every amendment as these amendments are offered because there are some good amendments that would be worth adopting on this bill in my opinion.

I commend the gentleman.

Mr. BARRY. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I hope those who either vote for this bill or against will see fit to support this amendment, because it indeed will accomplish comparability. Without this amendment we will be making a step backward insofar as this particular group of postal employees, which number over 40,000, is concerned.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, the Civil Service Commission is opposed to this amendment. The Post Office Department, which has full control and jurisdiction over these employees, because they are a part of it, opposes it. The Bureau of the Budget opposes the amendment. The administration is against it.

The amendment would cut down the amount of savings to be provided by the Murray amendment approximately $2 million, and thereby would not permit a balance with the figure in the President's recommendation to the Bureau of the Budget. If the amendment were agreed to it would hurt comparability and discriminate against classified workers in the same relative salary levels, who are not in the Post Office Department.

I believe the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. CORBETT. I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. I should like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] a question. The gentleman says that all these people are against the amendment—the Civil Service Commis-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

sion and the administration. Does the gentleman have anything he can introduce into the RECORD to prove that?

Mr. MORRISON. Does the gentleman mean the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? What record is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. BARRY. The gentleman previously made reference to the fact that the Civil Service Commission, the Post Office Department, and the administration oppose this amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. The Post Office Department testified against it.

Mr. BARRY. I wish the gentleman could produce that evidence.

Mr. MORRISON. If the gentleman will look at the records in the committee he will see it.

Mr. BARRY. We put this in in the committee, because we thought it was proper. The gentleman remembers that. He probably came along and voted with us at the time. Now he seeks to take it out on the pretext of a big saving.

Mr. MORRISON. That will save $2 million.

Mr. BARRY. It may save $2 million, but it will only create a further imbalance in the comparability principle which we have been trying to obtain. The whole business of salary reform will be thrown out of the window if we do that. It is penny pinching, which is pound foolish.

Mr. MORRISON. I could not disagree with the gentleman more. His amendment would destroy comparability.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I also am in full and sincere support of the Murray amendment. However, if there is an exception which can be justified it is this exception, which has been proposed by the gentleman from New York.

I am thoroughly committed to keeping the cost of the bill down to the budget figure, but I believe we can adopt this amendment in the interest of comparability and by adopting other amendments which will be offered later we can make up for the cost of $1.8 million which this amendment would involve. I believe this is the exception which more or less proves the rule, and ought to be approved.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am somewhat amazed, if not impressed, by the attack of economy which seems to have seized certain Members on the other side. The position seems to be that we have reached the point that we are willing to sacrifice the principle of comparability or the principle of equity in order to have alleged economy.

I remind my colleagues that this is the same kind of economy I was talking about yesterday. When we get it all done and wind it up, we leave the taxpayers stuck with an additional cost.

The facts of the matter are, on this matter of requiring the absorption of 10 percent of the cost, that that is a principle I supported and introduced amendments to provide for in previous pay bills. However, the simple truth is that this great concern about economy is activated by just one purpose; namely, to get this pay bill through superimposed on top of two recent pay increases. The purpose of all of this sudden affliction or attack of economy is to see to it that the taxpayers are stuck with the higher cost of the total payroll. For that reason I question very seriously the effectiveness of the kind of economy that is being advocated here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct your attention for just a moment to a discussion that the gentleman from Virginia and I had awhile ago. The suggestion was made that we were adding pay raise to pay raise to pay raise. I would like our colleagues to know that in the fall of 1959—that is 5 years ago—the Bureau of Labor Statistics completed a study on the amount of money necessary for city workers' family budgets in 20 cities and suburbs throughout the country. The Bureau of Labor Statistics described this budget as neither "minimum maintenance" nor "luxury." It was average. It is a budget that is considered necessary for a four-person family if it is to maintain a decent and adequate standard of living.

Let us look at a few of the amounts. In Houston, Tex., a family would require $5,370. In Pittsburgh it would be $6,199, and in Chicago $6,567. The family budget averaged out for all of the 20 U.S. cities at $6,083 a year. Please remember this survey is 5 years old, and the cost of living has risen 5.6 percent since that time. What I am trying to get at, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, is to show you that the salaries of Federal employees are not above the average. Let us take some of the salaries as they are presently being paid.

Post office clerks now receive an annual average salary of $5,860. City letter carriers get an average annual salary of $5,872. I do not want to bore you with a lot of statistics, but these are important to get in the RECORD. Postmasters of all classes receive $5,961.

None of these employees today receives an income approaching the average family budget that the Bureau of Labor Statistics thought 5 years ago was necessary for decent average living in the cities surveyed, and the legislation we are considering here today will not bring them up to date as far as the cost-of-living increases up to 1964 are concerned. Obviously, this legislation is needed and desirable in the face of these facts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for the work it has done in this field of comparability in our personnel practices in the Federal Government. I think there has been some excellent work done, and this is an important area for us to move forward in at the appropriate time. Now is not the appropriate time. I am opposed to the bill because I feel nothing could be more untimely than this bill at this time with the overall dangerous fiscal picture we have in this country. We do not have a balanced budget. We are going to have, under the administration's own figure, a $5 billion deficit at a time when we are in an economic upturn. The theory has always been that if we were going to indulge in deficits during periods of downturn, we must recoup during periods of upturn. The only thing President Johnson said about cutting expenditures is that the deficit will not be $10 billion but it will be $5 billion. Actually, I think a realistic appraisal of the budget revenue and expenditure estimates will reveal that the deficit is going to be closer to $10 billion. However, even with a $5 billion deficit the President in his economic report to the Congress warned us that to prevent inflation we must use these price-wage guidelines they have established to maintain the discipline that labor must exercise over its requests for wage increases and that management must exercise in the area of price. Here we are dealing right in this area that will set either a good or bad example for the some 90 to 100 major labor-management contracts that are going to come up for renegotiation this calendar year. We are debating here whether we are going at this time to increase governmental wages massively with these inflationary forces that exist with no reference to whether productivity gains have or have not been made by in the Federal governmental sector.

If the Consumer Price Index goes up 1 percent we lose $4 billion of purchasing power. It went up about 2 percent this last calendar year. The forces that we have at play now indicate that we are going to have an increase of about 3 percent. So this is an inflationary problem that would actually cause more damage to the very people we are trying to assist, not to mention the great damage to our Nation. Increasing Federal salaries at this time would be setting an example, the reverse of what is advised in the President's economic report. I do not think we can leave out of this context the fact that we have given everyone in the Congress and all of these Federal employees, along with the rest of our people, an actual raise in take home pay through the tax cut. There is not a Federal employee who does not benefit by that. So there already has been some raise given by this Congress. We should pay attention to this.

I do agree with the point that has been made that an overemphasis should not be laid in this bill on the increase in congressional salaries. That amounts to only 1 percent of the cost. Nonetheless it becomes of symbolic importance. It transcends its small ratio because if this Congress does not exercise judgment and discipline when its own salaries are involved, in this critical time of the balance-of-payments problem and inflationary forces that threaten our entire economic and, I should add, military posture, if we do not show that kind of discipline, what in the name of heaven is going to hold us in reaching proper decisions on these other difficult ex-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

penditure bills that will come before us?

Finally, on congressional salaries, I happen to oppose an increase here, too, for other reasons as well. These reasons are quite fundamental. I would agree that these salaries should be increased if the Congressman's job is to become full time; and indeed many argue that it already is full time. I suggest that for representative government to function as it is designed and as it must function, Representtaives should be members of their community and should be part time, not full time. Congress could get its work done in 5 or 6 months and, looking at salaries on that basis, they are adequate. But I do recognize there is a fundamental principle involved in our concept of representative government.

If those of you who believe we should be full time are correct in your evaluation, that we are full time, I do not think you are far off in regard to salaries. On the other hand, if those who adhere to my basic concept of representative government, that we must keep Representatives a part of their community, they must be back in their communities, then the theory of representative governments is that we are part time down here. I believe that the Congress could get its work done in 5 or 6 months, as I think it could. If this were the case then the present salaries are adequate. Indeed, by increasing salaries without deciding the key question of the nature of representative government, namely, should Representatives be full-time or part-time Federal employees, we tend to resolve the question without a debate.

But the overriding point at this time, I submit, is the very serious problem that we have with our overall fiscal posture. Domestically and internationally, I think to be fiscally responsible we must vote down this entire bill at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARRY) there were—ayes 20, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Murray amendment. I am particularly opposed to that portion of this amendment which has as its purpose the elimination of section 114(e) of the original bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal this morning about economy. I am for economy. However, I am not for economy at the expense of or at the sacrifice of our Federal employees. Equitable treatment of our postal workers is far more important, in my opinion, than the savings contemplated if the Murray amendment is adopted.

Mr. Chairman, section 114(e), the so-called Dulski amendment, was embodied in the bill, H.R. 8986, to correct an unfair and unjust provision contained in the Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962. As a result of the 1962 act, certain inequities resulted which denied fair and equal treatment to all employees for actual time served. I am certain that it was not the intent of the Congress at that time to take away from the postal employees any credit for services actually performed or for time actually served. Yet, because of the cutoff date in that law, October 13, 1962, we took away credit for the work which the postal employees performed in the computation of their salary level.

The purpose of section 114(e) in this bill, as it stands, is to restore the full and justifiable credit for all time actually served and for all services actually performed by our Federal postal employees. This, in my opinion, is a fair, equitable, and just amendment which should not be eliminated by the Murray amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no windfall involved in the Dulski amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we heard comment about the cost—$25 million, $30 million, $40 million, $48 million, and so forth. There is no intent to grant unearned salaries to any of the postal workers involved. The only aim and purpose of the Dulski amendment is to restore certain credits and rights which these postal employees had prior to 1962.

Mr. Chairman, regarding the cost involved. I say that the cost—whether it is $20 million, $40 million, or even $50 million—is immaterial if an injustice has occurred. Then the only concern we should have is to correct it, regardless of the cost.

Mr. Chairman, the Dulski amendment as contained in the original bill would do exactly that. In my opinion it is a fair and just proposal which is intended to correct this mistake that we earlier made. It is a corrective measure which recognizes the actual time served and the actual services performed by these postal employees.

Mr. Chairman, if we adopt the Murray amendment we will have denied the affected postal employees fair and just treatment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members of the Committee to give serious consideration to the Murray amendment and defeat it.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. RYAN of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I am particularly concerned about the effect of this amendment in striking out section 114(e), or the Dulski amendment, which is incorporated in the bill as it was reported out of the committee to the House.

The purpose of section 114(e), which the amendment would eliminate, is to correct an inequity resulting from the implementation of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. It provides postal employees credit for their full length of service in the computation of salary levels.

The imposition of a cutoff date of October 13, 1962, deprived many postal workers of full credit for prior service. H.R. 8986, as reported by the committee, sets up a formula to compensate the dedicated and conscientious postal workers for the inequities they have suffered. It is meritorious. It is just. It should be retained, in my opinion. I urge defeat of the Murray amendment.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I agree 114(e) would remedy an obvious mistake and a glaring injustice. I urge its retention.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILBERT. I wish to compliment the gentleman for his presentation in opposition to the Murray amendment, particularly with reference to the elimination of the Dulski amendment in the original bill.

I would like to point out one thing. There is a great inequity, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] and the previous speaker from New York [Mr. FINO].

I would like to suggest an example. If you have a level-4 employee who entered the postal service on October 1, 1956, was placed in step 8 on October 13, 1962, at annual wage of $5,685. An employee in the same level who entered the postal service 2 weeks later on October 15, 1956, was placed in step 7 and received an annual wage of $5,525. The latter employee will be required to serve 3 years in step 7 before going to step 8, thus earning $160 per annum less than the first employee. For the next five step increases over a period of 15 years the employee who entered the service 2 weeks later will be out-of-pocket at least $2,400.

This is a gross inequity. I believe the intention of the Dulski amendment should be kept in this bill in order that our employees in the Federal postal service will be treated fairly and equitably.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution to the debate. The example offered by the gentleman from New York illustrates the inequities which the Dulski amendment would correct. We should, therefore, defeat the pending amendment and retain the Dulski amendment.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to eliminating these provisions before us.

It is my firm belief that, in particular, section 114(e) of the bill succeeds in granting postal workers full credit for all the work they have performed in the progressive salary levels.

It is apparent that the Federal Pay Reform Act of 1962, by containing a cutoff date of October 13, 1962, brought certain inequities. In technical computation, an employee who commenced service only 2 weeks later than another

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

employee in, for instance, October 1956, will be entitled to far less income during the next 15 years than would be fair and just. This is a technicality involving the salary levels and the 1962 law.

I feel all employees should receive equal pay for actual time served. The provision in the measure before us will accomplish that end.

I refer to the bill before us, not the amendment.

The Post Office has estimated that retention of this particular section 114(c) provision will amount to an additional $46 million. This figure has been widely disputed, and justly so.

In the first place, pay adjustments will be amortized over a 1- to 6-year period. In addition, the adjustments themselves, affecting primarily those employees with many years of service, will produce a far smaller amount than $46 million.

In real terms this provision will amount to approximately $26 million for work actually performed.

This is the least we can do to insure that the postal worker is justly treated, and I trust the amendment before us will be resoundingly defeated.

AMENDMENT OFFEERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa to the amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY: After the period at the end of the substitute insert a new section limiting salary payments, as follows:

"SEC. 124. For the purposes of this section—

"(1) 'Department' means each department, agency, establishment, or other organization unit in or under the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, including a Government-owned or controlled corporation.

"(2) 'Public official' means any officer or employee of the Government of the United States or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, whether elected or appointed, in whom is vested the authority by law, rule, or regulation, or to whom such authority has been delegated, to appoint, promote, or discharge persons in connection with employment with any such government or to recommend persons for appointment or promotion.

"(3) 'Relative' means any person who is related to a public official as father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, wife, niece, nephew, father-in-law mother-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, stepfather, stepmother, stepson, stepdaughter, stepbrother, or stepsister.

"SEC. 2. (a) A public official shall not appoint, employ, or recommend for appointment, employment, promotion, or advancement to a position in the department in which he is serving or over which he exercises jurisdiction or control any person who is a relative of such official.

"(b) Any relative appointed, employed, promoted, or advanced in violation of this section shall not be entitled to compensation, and no money shall be paid from the Treasury of the United States as compensation to any relative so appointed, employed, promoted, or advanced."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is what is known as the antinepotism provision. This is identical to my bill H.R. 1134, which has been before the committee for about 3 years and on which I have been unable to get a hearing. However, I do believe that this is the ideal time, if the majority of the House want this kind of provision, to have it adopted; to wit, while we are dealing with all three of the branches of Government. I do not believe we should deal in this regard merely with one branch only.

This provision would apply prospectively. It does not apply to any of those who are now working, unless they have to be reappointed. I am practical about this. I know if somebody was appointed 10 years ago under these conditions, the majority would not vote to come along later, ex post facto, and deny them their salary.

This would affect new appointments to the executive branch. As far as the Congress is concerned, it would affect appointments in the next session of Congress and new appointments made hereafter this year.

I think the most common practice of nepotism is probably in small post offices. Most of those of us who represent several counties have some post offices with four or five employees, and we have entirely too many of them where the postmaster employs his wife. It does not make for a good morale situation in the post office. In some instances they will not take a permanent clerk from the eligible register unless their wife is on the eligible register. In this case, they will instead employ their wife as a temporary employee 8 or 10 months of the year. They may come to work late and get off early, and still get a good evaluation on the record. In these cases the Government does not receive full value for payments made to the postmasters relative and it also tends to reduce efficiency of other employees.

I think the prevalence of this practice is increasing in Washington too. Acknowledgment of this comes from the fact that the Civil Service Commission has finally adopted a rule that in summer employment there shall be no nepotism starting next summer. This was brought out by the facts set forth in the discussion on the Beckworth bill which was passed overwhelmingly by the House on two occasions. Actually, it is more obvious in summer employment than in permanent employment because all are new employees being hired. The same situation exists in Washington with permanent employees as in summer employment but is not as obvious because new employees are a lesser percentage of the total work force. As a department becomes larger, the personnel manager and branch heads, feel more sheltered from criticism and therefore nepotism will become more and more prevalent in these departments in the future. I will frankly admit that some of these employees are good employees. On the other hand, we have so many who are not earning their full salary and the situation created so harms the morale of those with whom they work, that I think it is better to prohibit nepotism entirely and cause these people to go to some other agency to apply for a position. If they are good capable employees, they can probably get a job in some other agency and will not need to have picked out just one little bureau within the whole Government of the United States to secure employment.

So far as the Congress is concerned, every Member surely recognizes that this is a husband and wife job in the Congress of the United States. Most Members work and are glad to work an average of about 60 hours per week and their wives also spend many hours answering telephones, helping where most needed or doing some kind of congressional work. Every wife renders services for the constituents of her husband but less than 30 are on the payroll. I believe wives who are not on the payroll do just as much as the average wife who is on the payroll. There is nothing illegal about putting wives on the payroll, but I think it is better in a salary bill like this to make whatever adjustment is needed for Members of Congress and let that be the combined husband and wife salary. I recognize that most people think Members of Congress and department heads should not receive less than subordinate civil service employees but I believe it would be better to do it directly rather than permitting a few Members to continue to finance usual family expenses by adding members of the family to the payroll. It is interesting to note that some of the most vigorous opponents of any adjustment in Members' salaries achieve the same result by practicing nepotism. I think it is better to put everything on top of the table. I do not deny anybody the right to have an opinion opposite to mine. Some have very strong opinions and some have examples where people who are hired under circumstances that could not be paid under my amendment are good workers and doing a good job and would be hard to replace. But I believe that overall the Government of the United States will be better off and it will get better in the future if we adopt this amendment and now is the ideal time to adopt such an amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there was a bill introduced, H.R. 1134, to prohibit nepotism in Government employment and for other purposes. Our committee asked for a report on that by the chairman of the Civil Service Commission. We received a strong adverse report. In other words, the administration and the Civil Service Commission opposes this amendment and the principle involved in it. Whereas we have never officially voted on it in our committee, many of our Members have discussed it. As a matter of fact, this bill, H.R. 1134, which was introduced has never been taken up by our committee for a vote and there is a letter from John Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, from which I will quote a part:

This is in further reply to your request for the views of the Civil Service Commission on H.R. 1134 a bill "To prohibit nepotism in Government employment, and for other purposes."

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

H.R. 1134 would prohibit public officials, either elected or appointed, in the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of the Government, from appointing, employing, or recommending for appointment, employment, or promotion in the department or other organizational unit in which the official is servicing, or over which he exercises jurisdiction or control, any person who is a relative of the official.

The Commission objects to this bill for the same reasons given in our report on an identical bill, H.R. 9812, in the 87th Congress.

Briefly, these reasons are:

1. While we agree that nepotism (or favoritism in any form) is not an appropriate basis for appointment under a merit system our experience with the "members of family" requirement in the Civil Service Act has led us to regard with disfavor restrictions on competition because of kinship. The "members of family" restriction (not more than two members of a family serving in permanent positions at the same time) is not the same as that proposed in H.R. 1134 but it is similar and its original purpose was the same.

We have found that on occasion it prevents the hiring of persons who are otherwise well qualified for Government work. Many of these persons have skills which are in short supply, and many, because they have been reared in a tradition of public service, are interested in careers in Government. We believe that H.R. 1134 would extend the adverse effects of the "members of family" requirement.

2. The broad extent of merit system appointment (about 91 percent of Federal employees are in the competitive service or a comparable merit system) precludes any significant incidents of nepotism. The competitive processes of examination, ranking and selection provide good assurance that the primary consideration in appointment will be ability, not family.

They say it is unworkable. Frankly, I believe it would do harm instead of good to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Iowa) there were— ayes 31, noes 70.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation and in opposition to the Murray amendment.

As a former member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I worked in the development of legislation which was passed by the Congress giving to our classified and postal employees an increase to bring their salaries close to salaries of workers in comparable industrial positions. This legislation also provided for annual review to assure our Federal employees an equitable salary. After passage of this legislation, it was found that there were inequities relative to step increases. The legislation we are considering today is just and proper legislation for correcting those inequities and again brings our Federal employees closer to salaries for comparable non-Federal employees.

This Congress, I believe, is carrying out its responsibilities to our Federal employees and the Nation in legislating fair return for the labors of these public servants.

This Congress has seen fit in the past and will probably in the future vote agriculture subsidies to protect the income of farmers. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, we are considering an agriculture budget for 1965 of upwards of $6 billion. We are using a portion of the tax dollars of all to protect the income of our farmers who are also an important segment of our economy and Nation. We also spend these tax dollars to find better agricultural products and cures for crop and livestock diseases and pests.

I believe, if it is just to spend tax dollars to help and protect this segment of our national economy then it is as just and proper, if not more so, to give to our Federal employees a fair salary. They are entitled to the means to purchase the fruits of that which they are helping to maintain and protect.

In regard to executive and congressional salary increases, I believe that this is a fair increase. There are many in this Nation who believe that we receive free transportation to and from our districts and all our living expenses here in Washington are paid by the Government. This we know not to be the fact. The fact is: it costs over $2,500 a year in travel expenses to and from my district alone, the living costs here average over $3,000 per year, and to this must be added an average of $5,000 to $6,000 a year for donations, ads in souvenir journals of various organizations, tickets, and so forth, most of which are not deductible.

I believe this is a fair and just bill and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DULSKI) there were—ayes 92, noes 18.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE SALARIES

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1963".

SEC. 202. (a) The gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law) in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this Act of each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be increased by an amount determined in the manner provided by this section.

(b) Except as provided by section 203 of this Act, the total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this Act of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased automatically, or is not permitted to be increased administratively, by reason of any other provision of this section (except subsection (d)), shall be increased by an amount determined in the manner provided by this section.

(c) Each of the limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this Act with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives shall be increased by an amount which is the same percentage of such limitation as that percentage which the amount of the increase provided by title I of this Act in the rate of basic compensation for the fourth step of grade 6 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is of the rate of basic compensation for such step immediately prior to such increase. The amount of each increase under this subsection shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

(d) The respective amounts of the increases provided for by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be determined in accordance with the following rules, as applicable:

(1) If the gross rate of compensation or the total annual compensation is less than the minimum scheduled rate of grade 7 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this Act, the amount of the increase in such gross rate of compensation or such total annual compensation shall be an amount which is the same percentage of such gross rate of compensation or such total annual compensation as that percentage which the amount of the increase provided by title I of this Act in the rate of basic compensation for the fourth step of grade 6 of such schedule is of the rate of basic compensation for such step immediately prior to such increase.

(2) If the gross rate of compensation or the total annual compensation of the officer or employee concerned is equal to or greater than the minimum scheduled rate of grade 7 of such schedule as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this Act, the amount of the increase in such gross rate of compensation or such total annual compensation shall be an amount which is the same percentage of such gross rate of compensation or such total annual compensation as that percentage which the amount of the increase provided by title I of this Act in the rate of basic compensation for the fourth step of the applicable grade is of the rate of basic compensation for such step immediately prior to such increase. As used in this paragraph, "applicable grade" means that grade of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this Act, with respect to the range of compensation rates of which the gross rate of compensation or the total annual compensation, as the case may be, is equal to or more than the minimum scheduled rate of such grade but less than the minimum scheduled rate of the next higher grade.

(e) All percentages determined under this section shall be rounded to the nearest one-half percent.

(f) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

(g) Section 202(e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a(e)), is amended—

(1) by striking out "$8,880" where it first appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,"; and

(2) by striking out "8,880" at the second place where it appears in such subsection

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(h)(1) This subsection is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change the rule amended by this subsection at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

(2) Clause 28(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

(A) by striking out "$8,880" where it first appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended,"; and

(B) by striking out "8,880" at the second place where it appears in such clause and inserting in lieu thereof "the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

SEC. 203. (a) The compensation of the Comptroller General of the United States shall be at the rate of $32,500 per annum.

(b) The compensation of the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States shall be at the rate of $30,500 per annum.

(c) The compensation of the General Counsel of the United States General Accounting Office, the Librarian of Congress, the Public Printer, and the Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $29,500 per annum.

(d) The compensation of the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives, the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Deputy Librarian of Congress, the Deputy Public Printer, and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $28,000 per annum.

(e) The compensation of the Second Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $26,500 per annum.

(f) The compensation of the Postmaster of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $24,500 per annum.

(g) The compensation of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $12,500 per annum.

SEC. 204. Section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 31), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of $32,500 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $45,000 per annum."

Mr. UDALL (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of title II be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. UDALL to H.R. 8986: Page 40, strike out lines 15 to 21, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) The compensation of the Deputy Librarian of Congress, the Deputy Public Printer, and the Assistant Architect of the Capitol shall be at the rate of $28,000 per annum."

And on page 40, strike out lines 24 and 25.

And on page 41, line 1, strike out "(g)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

And on page 41, immediately following line 10, insert the following:

"SEC. 205. No officer or employee subject to section 202(a) or 202(b) of this title shall receive, by reason of any provision of this title, an increase in gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law), or in total annual compensation, which is in excess of the amount of the increase in basic compensation provided by the amendment made by section 102(a) of title I of this Act for positions in grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, first I would want to explain to my colleagues that we have now reached title II of this bill. This is a title in which some of you may have a casual interest. The title is Legislative Salaries. For the next hour or two hours we are going to be discussing some things that will be of rather general interest around here, and I hope those Members who favor this legislation will stay on the floor. We may need you here.

We had a discussion yesterday at the beginning of the debate. The gentleman from Missouri said that in his judgment one of the things wrong with the bill was that the salaries provided for officers of the House were too high. I assured him then that I would offer an amendment—and it has the support of the majority of the members of the committee here on both sides—which would make some substantial reductions in those salaries. As a further part of this economy drive that we have had underway here today I am proposing this amendment.

The present salary of the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Legislative Counsel, and the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation—these are the four people who are now in one category—is $21,500. This is their present salary. Under my amendment they would go to $26,000. The other two officials involved in my amendment are the Doorkeeper, who is now at $20,800, and the Postmaster, who is at $18,300. The Doorkeeper would go from $20,800 to $25,300, and the Postmaster would go from $18,300 to $22,290.

Mr. Chairman, let me make just a few brief comments. The technical mechanics of my amendment are to strike out from the bill any attempt specifically to fix the dollar amounts of the salaries of these employees, as previously. What we do is put them in a position so that they may not get more than the maximum rates provided for the classified employee. The top rate for GS–18 provided by this bill will be $4,500 above the present salary. So the greatest raise that could go to any officer of the House under my amendment would be the same percentage which would turn out to be a total raise of about $4,500.

Some of you are going to say that these salaries still are too high. In defense of the officers of the House, let me speak to that for just a moment. The test, in my judgment, is what is the responsibility of this man; how many employees does he supervise; what is his budget; what do they pay in comparable positions of responsibility in State government or in private enterprise?

The Clerk of the House has more than 200 employees. He has a budget of $55 million which he is responsible for administering. He handles all of the bookkeeping. He disburses under his jurisdiction something like $55 million a year. For 100 years the salary of the Clerk of the House was the same as the salary of Members. Even if this amendment is adopted, he will be making something in the order of $6,500 less. So this is a substantial change and should meet the objections of Members who felt that the original salaries we fixed were too high.

The Doorkeeper of the House handles the House pages, he handles the House document room, he supervises the folding room.

He has large responsibilities and a very large number of employees under him. I think the salary we provide is reasonable.

The Sergeant at Arms has a cash accounting process down here amounting to more than $12 million a year. He runs a bank that handles $12 million a year. He has a total of 101 employees under his jurisdiction. He is responsible for the appointment and supervisior of the Capitol Police, the Capitol Police Board and some of the other important functions around here.

The adoption of this amendment will meet the objections that have been made and will give these very responsible officials of the House adequate salaries and keep a fair differentiation between the salaries of Members who must run for reelection, maintain two homes, and all the rest of it, and the officers who serve them in this House.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent amendment. It should be adopted. The amount of savings that will result are not great because there are not many individuals involved. However, in order to keep the salaries of these offices in proper perspective I believe this amendment should be adopted. I think it ought to be said also that none of the individuals holding these positions have come before the committee nor have they approached me in favor of getting themselves a greater increase. My thought is that it is a good amendment and it should be approved.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. I certainly take the same position. I believe most of the members of the committee on this side take a similar position. I believe this amendment is certainly meritorious and should be adopted.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSMER

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER as a substitute to the amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: Mr. HOSMER moves to delete section 203, commencing line 5, page 40, and ending at line 2, page 41; and insert the following:

"SEC. 203 (a) There is hereby established a Commission of Federal Legislative Compensation (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission').

"(1) The Commission shall be composed of eleven members, as follows:

"(A) Five appointed by the President of the United States, of whom two shall be personnel of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government who have had experience in Government personnel and salary matters and three private citizens who shall have had experience in personnel and salary matters in private industry;

"(B) Three appointed by the President of the Senate, from Government or private life, or both, and having experience in personnel and salary matters;

"(C) Three appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, from Government or private life, or both, and having experience in personnel and salary matters.

"(2) Persons appointed to the Commission shall be appointed without regard to political affiliation.

"(3) The term of office of each member of the Commission shall be five years. Each member shall be eligible for re-appointment. Vacancies on the Commission shall be filled by the respective appointing authority.

"(4) The President shall designate a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among the members of the Commission.

"(b) The Chairman of the Commission shall convene the Commission within ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act at a time and place designated by him. Thereafter, the Commission shall meet at least once every four years to carry out its duties.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the Commission to conduct, from time to time, studies and investigations of the compensation of

"The Comptroller General of the United States;

"The Assistant Comptroller General of the United States;

"The General Counsel of the United States General Accounting Office;

"The Librarian of Congress;

"The Public Printer;

"The Architect of the Capitol;

"The Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, the Postmaster, the Chaplain, and the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives;

"The Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation;

"The Deputy Librarian of Congress;

"The Deputy Public Printer;

"The Assistant Architect of the Capitol;

"The Second Assistant Architect of the Capitol;

"Senators;

"Representatives in Congress;

"The Resident Commissioners from Puerto Rico; and,

"The Speaker of the House of Representatives;

and of the compensation of officers and employees who occupy positions of comparable trust and responsibility in private industry in the United States and in the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government for the purpose of determining whether, and on what basis, an adjustment upward or downward in the compensation of such named officers and employees of the legislative branch is necessary and desirable in order to compensate such officials and employees of the legislative branch on an equitable basis in relation to that of employees of private industry in the United States and officers and employees of the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government who occupy positions of comparable trust and responsibility. The Commission shall submit a report to the President and to the Congress on or before December 15 of each second even-numbered year, beginning with the year 1964, with respect to the results of such studies and investigations, together with its specific recommendations for adjustments upward or downward in the compensation of each such named officer and employee of the legislative branch of the Federal Government. The specific adjustments in compensation submitted and recommended to the President and the Congress by the Commission shall have the force and effect of law on and after the beginning of the first session of the next following Congress of the United States thereafter, and the compensation of each of such named officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Federal Government thereafter shall be paid in accordance therewith unless otherwise adjusted by law. Until the compensation of such named officers and employees shall be adjusted as provided by this Act, each shall be compensated in accordance with provisions of existing law.

"(d) The Commission may hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places in the United States, as it deems advisable.

"(e) During the years, in which it is required to submit a report, the Commission may appoint for a period not exceeding six months, and fix the compensation of, a director without regard to the Classification Act of 1949. Such appointment shall be without regard to political affiliation.

"(f) The Chairman, under regulations of the Commission, may appoint and fix the compensation of necessary staff personnel of the Commission, during the tenure of its director, without regard to political affiliation and the civil service and salary classification laws.

"(g) Members of the Commission who are Government personnel shall serve without compensation other than compensation in their Government positions, but shall be allowed necessary travel expenses (or, in the alternative, a per diem in lieu of subsistence and mileage not to exceed the rates prescribed in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended), without regard to the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, or Section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (5 U.S.C. 73b), and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the Commission. Other members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission."

NOTE.—If the foregoing amendment passes, a motion will be made to delete Sec. 204, which fixes Members salaries at $32,500.

(Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps one of the very key amendments to be offered to this bill. I have advised all of the Members by letter that I would offer it today.

Throughout history Congress has fixed its compensation according to article 1, section 6, clause 1, of the Constitution which reads in part:

Senators and Representatives shall receive compensation for their services to be ascertained by law and paid out of the U.S. Treasury.

One way in a law is to indicate a specific monetary amount of compensation. Another way for a law to ascertain this compensation is in accordance with a formula such as contained in the amendment I have placed before the House.

Actually, we have no business fixing our own salary. We are not qualified to do so because of the closeness which we are to the business, and, secondly, the remoteness which we are from area of knowledge regarding comparable compensation in other branches of the Government, and particularly in private industry.

What this amendment provides is that a commission will be convened this year to report by December 15. It will make a survey of the salaries or compensation of all of employees listed in section 203 of the bill, including the Comptroller General, and so forth, as well as the Senators and Members of the House, and the compensation paid employees and officers of private industry in the United States, and of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, and determine what is a comparable salary for Members of the Congress of the United States and these other legislative employees.

There is little that can be said against the wisdom and fairness of such a means of ascertaining the compensation thus to be paid.

Let me add just this one further point. It is provided in this amendment the commission be convened every 4 years beginning in the year 1964. Its actions thereafter would be automatic. In other words, this takes it out of the hands of Congress to fix or establish monetary amounts from time to time and establishes a means whereby compensation of the Members and these other named officials may be ascertained by law in an alternative manner. I do not think I should have to argue this amendment one way or the other.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. As I understand it, this strikes section 203?

Mr. HOSMER. This strikes section 203, and if the amendment is agreed to I will offer an amendment to strike section 204 because it would be then redundant in the bill.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It was my intention to offer a similar amendment, but the gentleman's amendment goes further than mine. I think the amendment of the gentleman from California is better than mine; therefore, I shall support his amendment.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Why would not this same approach be applicable to salaries in all areas, not alone in this section?

Mr. HOSMER. I think the approach would be a good one for the executive and judicial salaries as well, and perhaps it might be a wise idea if whoever controls the motion to recommit would include it in the motion to recommit. I

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

think we would have here a means whereby this subject of the matter of salaries in the legislative branch could be handled fully and fairly and not by the persons whose pocketbooks are most vitally affected. The same principle, except for the latter consideration, applies in the cases of executive and judicial salaries.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. If the Members of the Congress are able to set the salaries of every other employee of Government, why are we not able to set our own salaries after advice from the executive department, which we have had, and after surveys have been made? Why are we not able to do that?

Mr. HOSMER. We are able to do so, but I seriously doubt the wisdom of doing so. That is why this proposal is made.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. How does this commission differ from that which was established in 1955?

Mr. HOSMER. In this respect, that when the commission makes its report and its findings those become the compensation scale for these named officers at the beginning of the first session of the next Congress immediately following that in which it reports.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, the procedure by which your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has already considered the whole of the pay bill and particularly with reference to legislative, judicial, and executive salaries, is substantially what is being proposed by this amendment.

The Randall Report, as we call it, was made pursuant to the appointment of a Committee by the President of the United States, and that report was made to the President in June, 1963. In the report he says, and I will read just the opening lines:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to present to you the final report of the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems. In your letter of January 29, 1963, you referred to the report of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-793) and asked us to consider three subjects: (1) appropriate levels for executive salaries; (2) the relationship between executive salaries and those payable to career employees; and (3) the relationship between executive salaries and those paid to Members of the Congress and the judiciary.

Very quickly I wish to relate who were on the Panel.

The Chairman was Clarence B. Randall of the Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems.

They had: Omar Bradley, general of the Army; John J. Corson, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University; Marion B. Folsom, Eastman Kodak Co.; Theodore V. Houser, Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Robert A. Lovett, Brown Bros. Harriman; George Meany, American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations; Don K. Price, Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard University; Robert Ramspeck, former Member of Congress from Georgia and former member of our Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service and former member of the Civil Service Commission; Stanley F. Reed, Associate Justice, now retired, Supreme Court of the United States; Sydney Stein, Jr., Stein, Roe & Farnham.

Then if you will look to the report that is filed here with the House, you will find on page 11 an analysis of the figures reported. In separate columns there are the present rates that the Advisory Panel recommends and what our original bill was, H.R. 8716, and then the final committee bill.

	Present rate	Advisory panel	H.R. 8716	Committee bill
Legislative:				
The Speaker	$35,000	$60,000	$50,500	$45,000
Members of Congress	22,500	[1] 35,000	35,000	32,500
Officers of House:		(1)		
Clerk of House	21,500	----------	30,000	28,000
Sergeant at Arms	21,500	----------	30,000	28,000
Legislative Counsel	21,500	----------	30,000	28,000
Doorkeeper	20,877	----------	28,000	28,000
Postmaster	18,346	----------	25,500	24,500
Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation	21,500	----------	30,000	28,000
Comptroller General of United States	22,500	----------	38,500	32,500
Assistant Comptroller General	20,500	----------	36,500	30,500
Librarian of Congress	20,000	----------	33,000	29,500
The Public Printer	20,000	----------	33,000	29,500
Architect of the Capitol	20,700	----------	33,000	29,500
General Counsel, General Accounting Office	20,000	----------	33,000	29,500
Deputy Librarian of Congress	18,500	----------	30,000	28,000
Deputy Public Printer	18,500	----------	30,000	28,000
Assistant Architect of Capitol	19,000	----------	30,000	28,000
Second Assistant Architect of Capitol	17,500	----------	27,500	26,500
Chaplain	9,422	----------	12,500	12,500
Executive:				
Vice President	35,000	60,000	50,500	45,000
Level I—Cabinet	25,000	50,000	40,000	35,000
Level II—Immediate sub-Cabinet	22,500	45,000	38,500	32,500
Level III—Deputy and Under Secretaries, etc	21,000	40,000	36,500	30,500
Level IV—Assistant Secretaries, etc		35,000	33,000	29,500
Level V—Heads of principal services, etc	22,000	33,000	30,000	28,000
Level VI—Heads and board members of smaller agencies, etc	19,000	30,000	27,500	26,500
Judicial:				
Supreme Court:				
Chief Justice	35,500	60,500	50,500	45,500
Associate Justices	35,000	60,000	50,000	45,000
Circuit Courts	25,500	45,000	40,500	35,500
Court of Claims	25,500	45,000	40,500	35,000
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	25,500	45,000	40,500	35,000
Court of Military Appeals	25,500	45,000	40,500	35,000
District Court [2]	22,500	35,000	35,000	32,500
Customs Court	22,500	35,000	35,000	32,500
Tax Court	22,500	35,000	35,000	32,500
Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts	20,000	----------	35,000	29,500
Deputy Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts	20,000	----------	32,500	28,000
Commissioners, Court of Claims	19,000	26,500	32,500	28,000

[1] Also recommended that $5,000 of Members' salaries be deductible for income tax purposes to offset living expenses; that the number of trips permitted each year between Washington and Members' States or districts be increased substantially; and that salaries of other officers in the legislative branch be increased proportionately to fit them into proper levels of the executive salary structure. H.R. 8986 does not change in any way present provisions of law affecting income tax deductions for Members of Congress or the number of trips they are permitted each year between Washington and their districts or States.

[2] Chief Judge, $500 more.

So what has already been done is that the Congress has been considering thoroughly the report of the committee appointed by the President and bringing it to the membership for final decision. We considered this proposition of delegating the authority to fix the salaries of Congress and of the executive and of the judicial branch to somebody else, but we concluded in committee that that is the job of the Congress. If, indeed, the Congress is to control the expenditures of this Government, we must fix the salaries of the executive under the classified act and under the Postal Act as well as the top executive salaries, and the same thing applies to salaries in the judicial branch.

The congressional salary in this bill is on the basis of historical comparison with the judiciary and the judicial salary, in turn, is based upon what we found and recommended as necessary in the executive branch.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. MORRISON), Mr. OLSEN of Montana was granted permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat repeating myself, but I want it to be understood the reason there has been recommended by the President and recommended by our committee an increase in the highest salaries in Government is because all of the salaries in the classified service and the postal field service have come up to that ceiling and the people in the top three and four grades of the classified service and the Postal Service are beginning to

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

crowd together because they are underneath the salaries of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial.

Specifically, there is an example in yesterday's evening paper telling of Mr. Williams of the Aeronautics and Space activity who is quitting the Government because his job does not pay him a sufficient salary. He is going to work for a corporation which, incidentally, has a Government contract so the Government is going to be paying Mr. Williams his higher salary and a carrying charge in addition.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. I might point out that I know the gentleman to whom our colleague has referred and I know him personally. In fact, he is a graduate of Louisiana State University. He was in charge of the entire Mercury project from the very beginning. I know of no man of the stature of Dr. Williams who is needed more in Government. Dr. Williams himself told me personally:

Congressman, if you do not get out there and get with the other Congressmen and Senators and get these salaries increased, I am not only going to have to leave but there are a lot of fellows in the same circumstances that I am in who feel the same way about this and who are likewise going to have to leave.

This gentleman is leaving because he will get $10,000 a year more in another job. I believe it will be quite difficult to replace him. I do not know of a man more needed than he is, in this particular job. I do not know of any more important job in our entire Government than the one in which he has been serving.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, on the subject of the amount, the Randall Panel made its recommendation based upon information it gathered from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, from the Civil Service Commission, and from many other sources. Specifically from the Civil Service Commission it received a survey which was made of 1,157 corporations in America in several industrial divisions: manufacturing, retail trade, banks, rail and air transportation, gas and electric utilities, mining and life insurance.

Illustrative salary data paid by various American non-Federal organizations—private enterprise—Total compensation of the 3 highest paid executives in 1,157 corporations, 1961 [1]

Industry division	Median compensation		
	Highest paid [2]	2d highest paid [3]	3d highest paid [3]
Manufacturing	$91,000	$63,000	$51,000
Retail trade	87,000	64,000	61,000
Banks	82,000	55,000	40,000
Rail and air transportation	81,000	49,000	40,000
Gas and electric utilities	74,000	49,000	37,000
Mining	71,000	46,000	40,000
Life insurance	53,000	35,000	30,000

[1] Compensation includes base salary plus any bonus or incentive award earned in 1961. Firms included, with the exception of banks and insurance companies, are restricted to those listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

[2] Usually the president or chairman of the board.

[3] Usually executive vice president or vice president of a major function.

Source: "Top Executive Compensation," Studies in Personnel Policy No. 186, National Industrial Conference Board, 1962.

PAY RATES OF $25,000 OR MORE IN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT [1]

Tabulations which follow do not include all State and local governments positions paying $25,000 or more. For example, only a few localities of less than 400,000 population are covered and there are known to be school superintendents and city managers paid $25,000 or more in other localities in the lower population brackets. Hence, the term "Partial" appears on each tabulation.

The least median in any of the 1,157 corporations, for pay, was $30,000. That was the least median.

This is the basis, then, for the Randall Report. This is exactly, in my opinion, what is being asked for again in the amendment being submitted.

Further, in the amendment there would be done the thing which I myself will not do. I shall not back away from the responsibility of being an elected Representative from my district in Montana. That is my job. I would be ashamed to have my salary fixed by someone else, and to duck out by saying, "I have to take it, because that is what somebody else fixed."

I know and all Members know it is the law of this land that we fix our salaries, as we fix them for the judiciary and the executive branch. I believe we must have that kind of courage and that kind of honesty with our folks, so that on the basis of facts presented us we fix this small portion of the pay bill—$5.4 million—the one-tenth of the whole pay bill. Our part of the pay bill is smaller than the Murray amendment, which was just passed.

I say that this smallest part of the bill should be easy for us to consider, when we consider the billions upon billions of dollars we pass upon from day to day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OLSEN of Montana was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. The gentleman is making the point that there is a double judgment here; first there is the judgment of a commission and then the judgment of a committee of this House, backed up by the judgment of all the Members of the House.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. That is my position.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. The gentleman believes this to be a better procedure than merely having a decision by a commission, which might not have sufficient staff and which might not do a good survey job, as to the setting of salaries for 435 Members of the House plus 100 Members of the Senate; is that correct?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. That is my point, in addition to the fact that I believe salaries must be fixed by a group of men directly responsible to the people. I do not feel that anyone else should fix salaries, other than responsible Members responsible to the electorate.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. The gentleman stated how much the Murray amendment would cut, and how much the amount would be with respect to congressional salaries. The salary increase of $10,000 per Member for 20 years—for the next 20 years—would be more than paid for by the amount of savings just voted under the Murray amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I wish to correct one statement. The Constitution does not provide that the salaries of Members of Congress be fixed by Congress; it provides that the compensation of Members will be ascertained by law.

It does not tell us how to write that law. One way to write it is with specific salary amounts. Another way to write it is in the manner the substitute amendment suggests. I respectfully suggest to the gentleman that this is as much an exercise of the responsibility of Congress to do it this way as it is to do it the way the gentleman suggests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest reluctance that I rise in opposition to an amendment offered by my good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER]. I take this time to develop further the very point on which the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] was commenting a moment ago. Let me read first of all from section 6 of article I of the Constitution:

The Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law.

Now let me read article I, section 1, of the Constitution:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

I am well aware of the fact that there are examples, all too many examples, I would add, of the farming out by the Congress of the legislative powers vested in the Congress by the Constitution. I cannot gainsay the fact that you can offer precedents for that. I do not

[1] Source: U.S. Civil Service Commission Special Study, March 1963.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

agree, however, that those precedents necessarily make this a wise or a sound practice. I submit that to abdicate the responsibility of direct exercise of legislative power in the matter of our own compensation is an act of evasion—and I am tempted to use the word "cowardice"—that is indefensible. I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle, a member of the committee, in saying that we must not back away from this responsibility. I might add further that we have here again another one of these examples of a reverse veto. It is proposed that there shall be submitted by this commission certain recommendations, and if I understand rightly the provisions of this amendment, they will become effective unless by the beginning of the next Congress they shall have been adjusted by law, which I presume to mean adjusted by a modifying act of the Congress. I do certainly subscribe to one proposition in this amendment, namely, that there should be no effective date for any increase in compensation of Members of Congress until the election of a House of Representatives has intervened. I think it is in order to point out in this connection that the first 12 proposed amendments to the Constitution, of which 10 were adopted and are known as the Bill of Rights, included one offered by Congressman James Madison which provided specifically that there should not be an effective date for a pay increase without such intervention of an election of the House of Representatives. I think that restriction could be made by statute and without the necessity of constitutional amendment.

I hope that if, unfortunately, the bill is adopted, the effective date for Members' pay raise will not be until January 1 of next year.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman spoke of the amendment to the Constitution offered at that time. However, the States failed to ratify that proposed amendment, did they not?

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. They must have recognized in the early days of our history that there would be a need for our not having to wait for an intervening election.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Evidently, in their judgment, they so felt. I reserve the right to disagree with them. But I will say this: There was no proposal at that time submitted, either by statute or by proposed amendment, for the Congress to delegate its legislative responsibility to a commission which the Congress could then use as an alibi for accepting its results.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Is there any difference so far as facing up to responsibility is concerned through turning this over to a commission, and failing to stand up to be recorded on final passage of a bill such as this?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Of course, the gentleman knows that any answer I give is prejudiced, because I think we ought to stand up and be recorded.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. Does the gentleman feel that it is wrong at all times to rely on any commission for any information or recommendation that we might desire?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] has expired.

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to proceed for 1 further minute.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, of course I am not going to accept such a proposition at all. I suppose there are occasions—I still favor this as a basic principle—where there is the right of the Congress to take final affirmative actions on the recommendations of a commission. But I said at the outset that there are abundant precedents for farming out of legislative responsibility. I am not going to say that it may not be justified or tolerated in certain circumstances. I do say that in this matter we ought not to duck the responsibility.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLIER. I do not think that this necessarily constitutes the farming out of a responsibility. As I understand the gentleman's amendment—and if I am wrong I stand to be corrected—it merely assigns the responsibility for consul and recommendation which the Congress will or will not have the right to accept or reject; is that correct?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOSMER. Congress is entitled at its will to make an enactment which entirely wipes out the adjustment or fixes the adjustment at any other stage it desires.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I respond to my good friend by saying again that I am reluctant to be in a position of opposing the gentleman for whom I have such high regard. But let me say, human nature being what it is, even among Members of Congress, I think it is a little more difficult to get action on the part of the Congress in a situation in which a commission of this type is making a recommendation. There is the law of inertia or gravity or whatever you want to call it that makes it very easy for the Congress to accept the result of its having delegated its legislative responsibility.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. May I direct the gentleman's attention to the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California? This is more than a recommendation. The language is that this action by this commission shall fix the salaries and it says it shall be the salary unless we, the Congress, thereafter otherwise adjust it by law.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman for making the point. It is a very important point. A recommendation presupposes that there must be approving or disapproving action. This presupposes requirement that the commission action become effective unless there is disapproving or altering action by Congress.

Mr. MULTER. In other words, it becomes effective when the commission acts. It becomes effective unless the Congress thereafter makes some changes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. And to that extent it is substantially more than a mere recommendation.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I object to the request.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. YOUNGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, one of my objections to this bill is to the method by which we have been fixing salaries—and it attaches not only to this bill but to the previous bill which I voted against. The simple reason is that we are not qualified for a proper survey has not been made of these salaries.

Mr. Chairman, nothing has been said about the blue-collar workers who work for the U.S. Government, just the same as everybody else who works for their Government. However, we do not hear anything on the floor of the House with reference to fixing the salaries of blue-collar workers. Their salaries are fixed otherwise. We have no arguments with reference to them. They are fixed in the various regions of the country. The workers are all happy with the method.

Mr. Chairman, some method must be worked out for fixing the salaries of the employees of the Federal Government so

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

that every 2 or 3 years we will not be caught in a bind such as we are caught in here.

Mr. Chairman, I have a great number of Government workers in my district. Our district is a high-living-cost one. They are not receiving justice insofar as their pay is concerned. This is true because every time the Congress fixes the salaries we fix them somewhere between the low-cost areas and the high-cost areas, and the Federal civil and postal workers in the district which I have the honor to represent never receive equity.

Mr. Chairman, our area in and around San Francisco is a high-cost area. Postal service people who transfer to that area from other States cannot make a living; whereas, they had a very good living in their former area of the United States. That is one reason why I shall vote against this bill.

Mr. Chairman, until we can find a method of fixing salaries by regions and not as the result of pressures and arguments in the Congress we are not going to achieve our aim.

I was quite interested in what the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] said with reference to avoiding responsibility. I know what is going to be done here today in an effort to try to prevent a record vote. I believe such maneuvering represents the greatest type of avoidance of responsibility I know about. When Members of Congress are called upon to authorize an appropriation of a half billion dollars of the taxpayers' money and then are not willing to be recorded on that expenditure they are doing a great injustice to the Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, my personal feeling is that this House should have a rule to the effect that no authorization or no appropriation exceeding $100 million be legal without a recorded vote having been had on the same. I sincerely hope that when the time for the vote on this bill comes all of us will be willing to record our votes, and if the bill passes, fine, well, and good.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE. I would like to ask the gentleman from California if this bill is passed and Congress votes the raise, will he take it?

Mr. YOUNGER. Now, that is not the question that is before us.

Mr. BURKE. It is a question which I am asking right now of the gentleman. Will the gentleman take the raise?

Mr. YOUNGER. Will I take the raise?

Mr. BURKE. Yes, will he take the raise?

Mr. YOUNGER. If I am reelected and I serve in the House I will take whatever the salary is for the job. However, that is not what I am arguing about. I am arguing about the question of whether the Members of the House will stand for a record vote. I will stand up and vote. I shall be willing to vote. I vote on a number of bills, when I am in the minority. That does not mean that I will not observe the law, just because I happen to be in the minority.

Mr. BURKE. If the gentleman will yield further, he is evading the question.

Mr. YOUNGER. No, I am not evading the question.

Mr. BURKE. In other words, the gentleman will take the raise if it is voted this year? That is what I am asking the gentleman. He will take the raise before the election?

Mr. YOUNGER. I say I will take the raise; yes, but I will vote against it and I want to say that I am willing to be recorded against it. Now, will the gentleman stand up for a record vote?

Mr. BURKE. I will vote for the measure, I will support it subject to certain clarifying amendments, and I will let the people of my district know. I do not know of any Member of this House who is afraid to do the same thing.

Mr. YOUNGER. You just wait and see. If the bill is passed that way all well and good.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I should like to ask the gentleman this question: If the amendment now before us fails, does not the gentleman feel there would be less criticism if the effective date of this bill were put off until the opening of the new Congress in 1965?

Mr. YOUNGER. I think so, yes. I think I would vote for an amendment to that effect.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. The gentleman stated he would vote for an amendment to make it effective January 1. Would the gentleman then vote for the bill?

Mr. YOUNGER. No, I will not vote for the bill because, as I said, there are too many inaccuracies in this bill and the fixing of salaries in this way is wrong. I have told my postal workers that under this system they will never get equality, not until we find a different method of fixing salaries, and therefore I will continue to vote against such bills.

Mr. DENT. I can appreciate the gentleman's position. We have an awful time in my committee trying to set up minimum wage laws on a regional basis.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows of any board of directors of any of the large corporations of this country who do not vote for their own salaries, for their own bonuses, for their own retirement system, for their own special insurance plan? Is the gentleman opposed to them doing that?

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman is trying to put the United States in the private industry class. I do not believe that the money of the taxpayers is in the private industry class. That is just a difference we have. So far as this bill is concerned—I want to repeat my opposition to it. It is like our legislature in California. They wrestled with this problem of salaries for years. Finally they put it back into the personnel board and eliminated the fixing of the salaries of employees by the legislature. The city of San Francisco has done that, all of our cities in our county have done the same. This is not a proper function for a large legislative body of this kind.

My objection to this bill rests mainly with the method by which they are fixed. As a result of the method we will never have equity so far as our employees are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, much of this debate has revolved around the effect of our vote for the salary increase upon the voters of our respective districts. Surely we are not dealing with one-half billion dollars of the taxpayers' money in a manner to buy votes in this coming election. If this be true, we are not entitled to our present salary. I plead that we have a recorded vote on this bill so that we who are opposed to this legislation may be recorded.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of amendments pending at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is not on the whole title?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] may have his full 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does this apply only to the pending amendment, and not to the title?

Mr. UDALL. Precisely.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order in the last 3 minutes of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I stated I would have an amendment to offer today to this title which would allow waiver of any amount or the total amount. Very frankly, since I made that announcement I have been subjected to some persuasion by the leadership on my side because it would put a number of fine people on both sides of the aisle on the spot. Quite honestly, that is exactly what I intended to do, but I have yielded to the persuasion. I will not offer the amendment, but since my word is good, I wanted to give that explanation as to why I will not offer the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

amendment, after having said that I would offer it.

Mr. Chairman, in the morning press—and I might say I have been here for nearly 16 years, and I have never taken the well to complain or in any way talk about any article that ever appeared about me in a newspaper—this morning in the Washington Post and other papers in the country under the byline of one Jack Anderson was an attack on Colonel Glenn, using me as a whipping boy. It said that I had in a standing vote, voted against the public accommodations section of the civil rights bill and that I had been observed doing this by somebody from the gallery, and that when they called my office I would not tell them whether I had or not.

That is an unmitigated lie, and Mr. Anderson never called me to check as to whether or not it was true. The Speaker has told me that he would issue a statement that I had not done this, and I do not think there is any Member on this floor or in this House that would say they saw me standing to vote for any crippling amendment to the civil rights bill.

I am not making this speech necessarily under cover of legal immunity, because I called my local paper, which comes out this afternoon, and which carries this column, and they told me they would put on the front page the statement I said it was an unmitigated lie. They are carrying that this afternoon on the front page.

I further said to the newspaper that I would be better off to let Anderson's statement stand, if my mail were any indication, because according to the mail from my district I should have voted to strike the public accommodations section, but since a principle was involved I did not. I am only making this denial because a principle is involved.

He said that one Jerry Cole, someone I have never heard of, watched from the gallery, called my office, and I jerked the phone out of my secretary's hands and said something to him. The truth of the matter is that the fellow called one of my secretaries six times and annoyed her and got fresh with her. She told me about it. We do not know who he is. This is the name he gave.

I said, "If he calls again, give him to me." He did call. I said, "What do you want?" He said, "I want to know how you voted on the public accommodations section." I said, "It is in the bill, isn't it?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Well, I am recorded as voting for the bill, and don't be bothering this office any more unless you want to get me personally, and then I will take care of it personally."

That is the whole sum and substance of the story. That is the kind of column it is. That is why as a matter of principle I have called Mr. Anderson a liar in the public print and I have called him one here again. And if he wants to sue, I will prove that in this instance he printed a lie in his column.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I think maybe we should back up and see where we are. About an hour ago I offered an amendment to reduce the increases provided for officers of the House, the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, and other officers of the House. To that amendment the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] offered an amendment which would strike out my provision and insert a whole new section. This section would set up a Commission on Congressional Salaries. That Commission would make an investigation to determine what salaries were needed by Members of Congress and others, and then certify or fix the salaries. They would go into effect unless the Congress within 60 days vetoed them.

The vote will come first on the amendment offered by Mr. HOSMER, and if that is rejected the vote will come then on my amendment, which will deal only with salaries of the Members and officers of the House.

I think the amendment has been fully and fairly debated. I hope the amendment to the amendment will be defeated and that my amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression when the gentleman asked for the limitation on debate, it would apply to title II. As I understand, it only applies to the Hosmer amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the understanding of the Chair that it applies only to the pending amendment.

Mr. HARSHA. Then, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. WHARTON.].

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Chairman, I have serious reservations concerning certain sections of H.R. 8986, which are in direct contravention of the Constitution of the State of New York, as well as other States.

Specifically, we from New York have always felt that any salary increase applicable to an elective office should in no event take effect during the current term or tenure of that office. The practical effect of that very desirable constitutional provision is to give the electorate an opportunity to protest at the general elections, in the interest of good government as well as honest and orderly procedure. To be more precise, anyone who seeks public office presumably knows something of the duties and emoluments of that office and if he doesn't, he does not deserve to be supported at the polls. It is unthinkable that after assuming office, anyone should take immediate steps to raid the Public Treasury for their personal gain.

I have no quarrel with the need for adjusting Federal salaries consistent with private industry and the cost of living, but do feel the taxpayers should have an opportunity to voice possible objection to an increase of our salaries in midterm. This provision of the present legislation is especially repugnant and I urge the defeat of any bill of that nature.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise only to correct the RECORD. I believe that my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] misspoke himself as to who fixes the salaries in the city of Los Angeles which is the largest city in the State and the County of Los Angeles, the largest county. Salaries are fixed by the elected legislative branch subject to the normal right of veto of the executive.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. I never mentioned Los Angeles. I said San Francisco, the State of California and cities in San Mateo County.

Mr. CORMAN. I did not hear the gentleman limit his reference to cities to San Mateo County, but I would say further in the city of Los Angeles and in the County of Los Angeles, the local government follows the policy of fixing salaries based on comparable salaries in private industry with the result that we have a high level of municipal service at minimum cost. It seems to me if city councilmen can face up to the responsibility of fixing salaries so can the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that following the vote on the pending amendments, there will be an amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] which would strike out the increase in pay for Members of Congress. Personally, I intend to support the Cunningham amendment. I do not believe in the present fiscal circumstances with the deficit that is anticipated this year, that we should be voting for an increase our own salary

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I had announced that I would offer an amendment to strike all of title II, and I will do so if I have the opportunity after other amendments have been offered. I also have another amendment which, if that should fail, I shall offer at the appropriate time to place some limitations on the amount of increase in Members' salaries. At the present time we are faced with the decision of deciding between the least objectionable of the provisions that are open to us to decide upon. As I said, I would like to see all of them deleted and I hope that

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

that is done. However, I would prefer the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] rather than the language that is in the bill. I would also call attention to the fact that his amendment should have covered all of the other parts of the bill applying to other employees of the House. I think this part of the bill should never have gone to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. That has been the obligation and under the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration, I have been trying for years to get something done about all the gobbledegook that we have in our base pay. I hold in my hand, and I am sure all Members are familiar with it, the 10 different steps we take in raising the pay of employees of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOSMER) there were—ayes 26, noes 143.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Page 35, strike out line 13 and all that follows down through the period in line 10 on page 41.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. For a unanimous-consent request I yield; yes.

Mr. MORRISON. I wonder if we can agree that all debate on the amendment and all other amendments to title II end in 20 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for that purpose. That would come out of my time.

Mr. MORRISON. After consideration of the gentleman's amendment, could all debate on all amendments end in 20 minutes?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move that be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska has the floor. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No, because I wish to make a statement. Following my statement the gentleman can be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this will evidently be an unpopular amendment, because it would strike in its entirety title II, which has to do with an increase in Members' salaries.

I would be appreciative if the Members would read my minority views which are in the committee report, page 137. In my minority views I state that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee should be concerned with a study and make recommendations on postal and classified salaries as in title I.

In the 8 years I have served on the committee I have supported salary increases for these people and have worked hard in their behalf and that type of legislation is in title I.

However, the other three sections, the legislative, executive, and judicial, in my opinion do not belong on the Post Office Committee agenda. I might say, regardless of what denials or objections are made to what I am going to say, that there was no study of the salaries by the committee that are provided in the legislative, executive, and judicial. I do not know where this table of salaries was written, but it was not written in the committee. So I believe, and I certainly do not deny any Member of this body the right to vote yes or no as far as his salary increase is concerned, but I personally do not feel that I should vote myself an increase in salary and I will not do so. I was elected at a certain salary, and even though I, like others, have problems making ends meet, I do not feel that I can and I certainly will not vote for an increase in my own salary.

In my remarks in the minority report I stated, and I want to reiterate, that this package of legislative, executive, and judicial salaries, regardless of how you feel about it, should go to the Committee on the Judiciary, as it always has in the past. Mr. JONES of Missouri spoke about the Government Operations Committee. Perhaps that committee should consider this. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee is charged with title I—that is, the post office salaries and the Classified Act salaries. But evidently the other three sections could not stand on their own feet, so they were made a part of this bill. Therefore I say, Mr. Chairman, that this section should be divorced from this bill so that those of us who have the best interests of the postal and rank-and-file classified workers at heart can help them without having to vote for an increase in our own salaries.

In closing my minority views, I said:

In the final analysis, each Member will have to decide for himself what he wants to do. But I do believe that these proposals should be separated as mentioned above. I agree with what Lyle Wilson of UPI said in his syndicated column.

He did not take a special position on this legislation, but he did end up by saying, that every Congressman should be counted in a record vote on this pay raise and I again say I agree to that.

I hope whether you are for one or against one, and without criticizing any Member for his stand, that we can have a record vote, because, as has been mentioned in general debate, I think it would be necessary and I shall vote against an increase in my salary.

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment. It strikes out all of title II. I know every Member here understands exactly what this amendment does. We could stay here, I think, and talk for the next 2 hours, but I do not think it will change the way one Member is going to vote, so I say let us go ahead and vote it up or down and get on with the bill.

I yield back the rest of my time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as I have stated before, I had planned to offer an amendment exactly like the amendment that has been offered to strike out all of title II. The first part of title II only compounds and further confuses the formula under which we determine the pay of employees of the House of Representatives. I would say that there is not a soul in this House who, without referring to this salary table here—and I doubt if some of us even with the benefit of this—could tell us or anybody so that they could understand it what the wording of pages 36 and 37 mean or how much the salaries would be affected.

I have talked to several employees of the House whose salaries in the past have been fixed by action of the Committee on House Administration after being approved by the House and I have not found one who knows how much his salary would be increased by this bill. I think all of this needs a thorough going-over and that we need to come down to specifics.

I am not going to put this table in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; I am not trying to publicize it, but I think almost everyone will admit that it is rather silly to take a base salary and add to it 10 different formulas in order to arrive at the salary of an employee of this House. And this bill would add another step to that and further complicate it. I hope that this whole title is stricken and that the Committee on House Administration can take up this particular problem and get it solved. I think something needs to be done about it.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] said a minute ago that everybody knew what this amendment would do. I think that is right. It will just remove all of title II. However, if you do not remove it, you are going to leave something in the bill that nobody understands. I would rather vote for something I do understand than to leave in the bill something that I do not understand and which I think is wrong. So I am hoping that we will have an opportunity to stand up and be counted on this bill when the time comes. I will vote for a change, an adjustment upward in the salary of Members of Congress and employees of the House. But I do not want to be sandbagged into doing it. I think this legislation was put

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

into this bill because they said, If old Paul Jones has $10,000 in it, that will cause him maybe to vote for the rest of the bill. I like $10,000. But I am not going to be sandbagged into voting for a whole lot of other gobbledygook in order to get it. I hope we will leave the legislative title out of this bill.

There is another thing I want to call attention to. We are taking care of only the House part of the legislative branch. I do not know what will happen when this bill is sent over to the other body, and how it will look when it comes back here, what kind of salaries will be in it. I say let us leave it out and let the House take care of its own business through the Committee on House Administration as it has done with House employees in the past. I think we can do a much better job.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentlemen from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The provisions of the Cunningham amendment, the Jones amendment, and my amendment are the same?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. I would like to say to the gentleman regarding the salaries of our own legislative employees that I agree with him 100 percent, and I hope that in the committee in which we both work, the House Administration Committee, he will offer such a bill in the near future.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I hope the gentleman will vote with me at this time to take this whole title out. Then you will have the opportunity to do it. If we let it stay in we will not have that opportunity.

Mr. CORBETT. Certainly we will.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No.

Mr. CORBETT. This is a matter of giving the legislative people the same consideration which we give the classified people. We have no guarantee of the action that will come on a bill such as the gentleman proposes, because we have had this rather queer situation for many years and no action has been taken.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They have had 10 raises over this period of time about which I have been speaking. I would like to see the Congress undertake a study of the salaries of certain employees of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CORBETT. I join the gentleman from Missouri in this thought, but we cannot be sure that it is going to happen this year, when it has not happened during the past 10 years.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Oh, yes; we have taken care of them.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman's motion has specific reference to this one amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHANSEN. What is the amount of time provided for under the motion for further debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes, on this amendment.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I object.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment conclude in 10 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a paliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana prevails and we close debate, would such action preclude the offering of a new section at the end of line 10?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] for two-thirds of a minute.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that we will strike out any and all salary increases for Members of Congress. I feel that we should not increase congressional salaries until we do something for the thousands of retired workers throughout the country who are trying to subsist on meager annuities of $40, $50, and $60 a month. I am very much in favor of the increase in pay for postmasters, postal employees, and other Federal employees whose salaries are not in line with those being paid outside of Government. In the event the congressional salary section is deleted, I can support the rest of the pay raise legislation with enthusiasm, otherwise I will have to vote against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CUNNINGHAM: On page 41, strike out lines 6 through 10, and substitute therefor the following:

"(a) The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be increased by 15 per centum of their present salaries, which percentage is the amount of the rise in the cost of living since the last salary increase for these officials in 1955. In addition thereto, each of such officials shall be reimbursed monthly for all travel expenses for trips relating to his Congressional duties to and from the Congressional district which he represents, and shall also be reimbursed in the sum of $200 each month for costs and expenses of residency in Washington."

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment would make it possible for us to take the American people into our confidence and would give to them an increased awareness of the problem.

Mr. Chairman my amendment would grant pay increases to Congressmen in the percentage amount of the cost-of-living increase since 1955, which was the date of the last pay increase. What reasonable man could object to that.

It further provides for reimbursement for travel expenses to and from our individual districts on official business. What reasonable man could object to the reimbursement of Members of Congress for their travel expenses? How can we expect an employee to pay out of his own pocket his cost of traveling when traveling in behalf of his employer?

Mr. Chairman, we go home for the purpose of taking care of the business of our constituents. We go home to serve our constituents.

Furthermore, we must live in Washington and as a result thereof have out-of-pocket expenses here as well as those necessary expenses back home. We are required to maintain two places of residence.

Mr. Chairman, mine is a reasonable and fair amendment. It is much more desirable than an across-the-board increase of $10,000 per year because it talks frankly to the American people. I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

(Mr. STINSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cunningham amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that the pay of our postal workers and Federal Civil Service should be on a level with private industry. This is necessary in order to attract and keep good people. The portion of H.R. 8986 that deals with our postal and civil service employees is good and I fully support it. However, I believe that Congressmen should not have a pay raise at this time and I greatly resent the fact that the congressional pay raise was tacked onto this bill.

If the congressional pay raise provision is removed from the bill, I shall vote for it. If not, I shall not vote for it because I cannot in good conscience vote for a pay raise for myself.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cunningham amendment. I believe the 44 percent increase in congressional salaries as provided in the bill is exhorbitant and out of line. The Cunningham amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

(Mr. QUIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I hope we will have an opportunity to vote on the record on this bill. I will stand to secure a record vote. In the event a sufficient number of my colleagues do not stand with me so that we might be on record, I am taking this opportunity to let all know where I stand.

I will vote in favor of the Cunningham amendment to strike Title II: Federal Legislative Salaries. When the amendments are offered, I will support efforts to strike Title III: Federal Executive Salaries and Title IV: Federal Judicial Salaries. In the event these amendments are successful, I shall vote for the bill. If they are not, I shall vote against it.

The reason I am in support of Title I: Federal Employees Salary Systems is that through it the Congress is fulfilling its commitments in Public Law 87–793 passed in 1962. This was the comparability principle, established in that law, and to be used in establishing Federal career salaries. The Bureau of Labor Statistics makes comparability surveys and on these are based the increases in title I of H.R. 8986.

As the report on the bill indicates on page 5, the comparability principle can decrease by as much as 50 percent the annual increased salary expense which otherwise might be incurred in future years. If we are to have efficient, highly qualified Federal employees, this principle must be adhered to. The high salaried executive personnel can be expected to be attracted due to a feeling of service. However, this cannot be expected of the classified and postal employees even though there is a great feeling of service amongst many of them.

The report on page 13 states that "comparability" is not recommended for high offices. It states that achievement of full salary comparability with private enterprise for high Government offices is neither appropriate nor practical. I believe that at this time with continued annual Federal deficits, the increases for the top legislative, judicial, and executive offices are not appropriate which this bill provides.

The increases for Senators and Congressmen are $10,000 per year, Cabinet officers increases are $10,500. These are the men who have the major responsibility for the continued Federal deficits. Federal judges' salaries are increased by $12,550.

These increases are difficult for people of my district to understand when their annual income on an average is less than $5,500. I maintain that the highest Federal officer should be well paid, but increases to the amount in this bill are so out of line that I shall vote against the bill if they are included.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

(Mr. WATSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, although I was not a Member of this body in 1962 when the comparability principle for Federal pay was enacted into law, I subscribe to that position and, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I worked to bring about comparability of salaries in this pay bill. Naturally, a measure of such magnitude will have imperfections and unjustified disparities within certain classifications; however, I believe the bill under consideration does rectify or eliminate some of the inequities in our Federal salary schedule.

As I have stated so often, I believe in paying employees well; for the productivity and efficiency of one adequately paid employee will be greater than that of two underpaid and dissatisfied employees. Therefore, I favor the increases for the classified and postal employees and have so advised them. My position on that issue remains unchanged.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, as I stated to the fellow members of my committee when voting to report this bill to the House, I reserve the right to oppose the measure on the floor unless congressional and Supreme Court pay increases are removed or drastically reduced. Frankly, the proposed increases in these categories are both unwise and exorbitant.

Economy and fiscal responsibility begin at home. As a Congressman I cannot call for strict economies in other agencies and activities of the Federal Government while at the same time supporting a salary splurge for ourselves. With the present exorbitant debt limit and the recent substantial tax reduction measure which has recently become law, it is absolutely imperative that we curtail nonessential expenditures and keep essential increases to a minimum.

Mr. Chairman, candor compels me to admit that I could use to good advantage the proposed congressional salary increase, but my conscientious belief as to what is best for the Nation and the people of my district must be paramount to my own personal interests. It is not only a matter of conservatism for me but, also, one of conviction.

As to the salaries for our Supreme Court Justices, I frankly share the opinion and belief of many of my constituents that actually the Chief Justice and some of the other members of the U.S. Supreme Court are presently overpaid. Certainly I cannot vote to increase the Chief Justice's salary to $45,500 when many of his decisions and public pronouncements have not been, in my humble judgment, for the best interests of citizens.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, if the House persists in the passage of this congressional pay increase I shall propose an amendment to the bill making such salary increases contingent upon the balancing of our Federal budget. At least, the requirement for the balanced budget before such increases shall be effective would be a helpful stimulant in bringing frugality and fiscal responsibility to our National Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to knock out of the bill any raise in congressional salaries. It would bring about a situation where the Chief of Naval Operations, an admiral, receives $32,000 under legislation we passed last year, his boss the Secretary of Defense $25,000, his boss the Secretary of the Navy, who makes $22,000, while the great chairmen of the Committees on Armed Services in the House and Senate will receive only $22,500. It would leave in the bill raises under the Classification Act for 16's, 17's, and 18's, but would downgrade your own staff members, the key staff people on whom Congress depends.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. The salary changes should stay in, and this amendment should be met head on and voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

(Mr. HEMPHILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I rise in support of the Cunningham amendment, particularly because I do not believe that we, as Members of a sitting Congress, should raise the pay level of this Congress. Each of us ran for office knowing that the salary was $22,500 a year and we asked the people of our respective districts to send us to this office on the basis of such salary. If we intended to raise the salary we should have told them on the respective stumps of our respective districts that we intended to raise the salary of the office of which we would hold.

Do not think from this statement that I do not believe in good salaries and good wages. I do. In fact, I think the salary of the Members of Congress should be raised but that they should be raised after the next Congress and let the people of the respective districts vote into office a candidate for that particular office at that particular salary. If the effective date was January 1965, so that the people could elect the 89th Congress on the basis of the increased salary, I would be much more in favor of the bill.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] approached the matter very practically. He took the cost of living index and provided for certain travel expenses. Certainly this is a very fair approach and I would support that amendment except for the effective date which would raise the salary for which I ran and I will not vote to change the salary while I am drawing the salary.

Insofar as the legislative assistants are concerned, I would prefer a system in

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

which we had the entire responsibility of fixing the salaries of the people who assist us in our various congressional offices. We now have a formula or series of formulas which, to some extent, hides the true salaries we are paying, and I do not believe in hiding things from the American people. I can say this with a clear conscience as it is well known that I pay as good or better salaries to my staff and I am proud of it. I am proud of them and I am always in favor of giving them a raise when they deserve it but I think I should have the individual responsibility instead of Congress passing some new formula.

I want to support the raises for Post Office and civil service employees. I am particularly interested in the Internal Revenue Service employees who have the difficult task of intensive work in administrating the complicated tax laws and who deserve more recognition by better salaries. Unfortunately, if voting for the bill would include a raise in pay which is against my principles, I cannot vote with them, as much as I would like to as it becomes a matter of integrity with me in considering my own salary. I took this position when I was in the State Legislature of South Carolina and I feel it is a proper and just position to take now.

For this reason I am going to support the Cunningham amendment and I wish the legislative provisions were either amended or stricken so I could vote for the rest of the bill.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, coming from California I rise to support the gentleman from New Jersey. We can do much better in California under his amendment. To be quite truthful most Members would rather receive tax-free expense allowances than a fully taxable pay increase. The gentleman's amendment would be perhaps difficult to police and might be subject to abuse. But as a California Member we must admit that the cost of getting home to service our constituents is high and almost prohibitive unless it is a taxable expense. Our present allowance of two business trips a year when we sit from 9 months to the whole year is obviously not enough to keep proper contact with our friends at home. Some adjustment based on geographical distance would be the best way but lacking this, Mr. JOELSON'S amendment is a great improvement.

(Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cunningham amendment. I have an amendment at the desk which strikes out titles II, III, and IV from this bill, but because of the parliamentary procedures it can not be offered in that form, but must be offered to each title as it is read. Therefore, we must go through this procedure piecemeal. However, my remarks are addressed to all three titles. It is my firm conviction that all three of them should be stricken.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is identical to the Cunningham amendment. I have endeavored to obtain recognition, but because of the policy of recognizing members of the committee first, the gentleman from Nebraska was able to offer the same amendment ahead of me. However, it makes little difference who offers the amendment so long as it is accepted. I have similar amendments to other sections of the bill which will strike out pay raises for the judicial and executive branches; however, I understand the gentleman from Nebraska, a member of the committee, will offer similar amendments so I will support them. Mr. Chairman, this amendment and the others that will follow are very easily understood. They simply elimniate all persons from H.R. 8986 except classified and postal workers. In other words, it would eliminate from this measure, the raise for the executive branch, the judicial branch, and the legislative employees, including Members of Congress.

Just 2 weeks ago, this Congress passed the Revenue Act of 1964 authorizing a tax cut of over $11 billion. Then, and during the debate last fall on this bill, we heard many pious speeches about holding down expenditures; about practicing economy in Government. We promised the American taxpayer that we were going to be frugal with his tax money. In fact, one of the arguments propounded in favor of the tax cut was that it would force the Congress to cut down on Federal spending. Furthermore, the declaration by Congress in section 1 of the Revenue Act states that it is the sense of Congress that the tax reduction provided by this bill, through the stimulation of the economy, will, after a brief transitional period, raise revenues and that such revenue increases should first be used to eliminate the deficits in the administrative budgets and then to reduce the public debt. I want to repeat that again—"should first be used to eliminate the deficits and then to reduce the public debt"—and what are we attempting to do—practically the first thing we endeavor to do is raise congressional salaries by about 44 percent. Is this declaration of policy just so many idle words to pacify the taxpayer?

This declaration also provides that, to further the objective of obtaining balanced budgets in the near future, Congress, by this action, recognizes the importance of taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending. It is difficult to understand how we restrain Government spending by proposing the exorbitant pay increases advocated in H.R. 8986 for the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of this Government. If Members of Congress are unwilling to exert restraint on spending in connection with their own salaries, it is difficult to believe that the Congress can exert a reasonable degree of restraint in connection with other Federal expenditures.

The public has been told of the great sacrifices on the part of all, which are necessary in maintaining a sound economy. This Government has been encouraging, and no doubt in the future will encourage, labor and industry to hold the line on wages and prices. Yet, we in another breath, attempt to raise congressional, judicial, and executive salaries from roughly 30 to 50 percent. Apparently, Congress intends to throw the restraint it spoke of in the tax bill to the winds. An increase by this amount cannot be justified at this time.

The average American wage and salary earner has an annual income of around $5,000. To increase executive, judicial, and legislative salaries by twice that much is difficult for the average American voter to comprehend and those of you who hope to return next year, may have cause to regret this action. The American voter is no longer uninformed.

What about the poor social security pensioner who is required to live on $73 per month or $128.70, if married. You all have received mail from these constituents asking for a modest increase. Yet, none is forthcoming.

Look at the World War I veterans who are asking for a pension of $100 per month and have filed a discharge petition in an effort to get the bill out of committee. Yet, by this bill, you are increasing the salaries, some of them by almost $1,000 per month. If you think you can justify this action to the social security retiree, to the World War I veteran, to the unemployed and to the average wage earner of this Nation who earns about one-half of this suggested raise, I am afraid you are going to be sadly mistaken.

Now, just a word about the judges. Most of them are appointed for life and are granted generous retirement benefits to which they make no monetary contribution. No one can seriously contend that the Federal judiciary is shabbily treated in terms of compensation or retirement benefits.

As far as the Cabinet officers are concerned, there has been no difficulty in obtaining qualified applicants for these positions. Most of them, when they leave private endeavors to come with the Government, do so, not because of the pay involved, usually they come at great financial sacrifice, but because of a desire to serve their country. Government could not possibly pay them what private industry or endeavor does. An increase of this kind will not encourage more qualified personnel to join Government, but rather will add to the already exhausting burden of the taxpayer.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that this amendment will be adopted so we can give the postal and classified employees their promised raise. In 1962 when we passed the pay raise bill for these employees we cut the amount down and promised them a comparability study and further if this study indicated a raise was due them we would in turn provide it. That study has been made and indicates they are entitled to a raise. We should honor this commitment and grant them their promised raise. This portion of the bill I support and would urge my colleagues to support it. By striking titles II, III, and IV from the bill we will be keeping our commitment to the American taxpayer and then this Congress will be in a position to pass title I and thereby fulfill our obligation to the postal and classified employees. Our pledge to the American people in the tax cut legislation requires us at this time to eliminate legislative, executive, and judicial salary increases from this legislation. I urge the adoption of this and subsequent amendments to accomplish this end.

Mr. Chairman, unless these amendments are adopted I can't in good conscience vote for this measure. I feel our pledge in the tax cut bill to the American people precludes any of us from voting for this bill with raises in it for the legislative, judicial, and executive branches.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

(Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to oppose the pending pay raise bill. At a time when the current deficit is estimated at about $10 billion, in the face of which the Congress recently enacted a bill reducing taxes by more than $11 billion annually, it is difficult to see how the Congress can justify this pay increase which would cost more than $600 million a year.

This is particularly true in view of the general pay increase for Federal employees approved less than 2 years ago, costing in excess of $1 billion annually.

If this bill is enacted, and if history repeats itself, the effect will be to encourage another round of wage raise demands in private industry all over the country, with the resulting inflation. Now, of all times, it behooves the Congress to set an example of frugality and restraint in this wide area of the Federal payroll.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the rule on this bill so that the House could work its will. There are thousands of Federal employees and officers other than Members of Congress affected by this measure.

In view of the failure of the House to make material changes in the bill and in view of the further fact that we are supposed to be trying to economize on the cost of Government.

I cannot and will not support this measure which will add over $500 million per year to our cost of the Federal Government.

I could support a bill for those in the lower pay scale, and have done so in the past where a raise is needed badly, but I can not on one hand advocate economy and then on the other vote to increase my own pay 40 percent regardless how much I would like a pay raise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of both equity and economy may I ask the author of this amendment whether it is his intention to take the same action on the sections of the bill covering the executive and judicial branches?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It is.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

(Mr. WINSTEAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending bill because of my conviction that it goes too far and is entirely too all-inclusive. Under provisions of this bill, Members of Congress, Supreme Court Justices and other high Government officials would receive salary increases of more than 40 percent. I personally cannot see the necessity of any such increases to people who are already receiving $20,000 or more per year. I think this action is uncalled for and cannot be justified at this time.

I have consistently voted against excessive spending by the Federal Government in the hope that we could balance the budget. I cannot, therefore, lend my support to this measure, particularly in view of the present deficit and the recent tax reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cunningham amendment.

There has been some discussion to the effect that if title II remains in this bill every Member will be sandbagged into voting for it because of his own self-interest. That is why I favor the Cunningham amendment and will support it when it comes to a vote. The reason goes something like this: Our friends in the classified service and some of our good friends in the postal service write to us saying Members of Congress are entitled to a $10,000 increase. They do so knowing that such a statement will lend encouragement to us to vote for our own pay increase, knowing that in the same bill are increases for the authors of these letters. I have no grievance against such correspondents but I think we have to look at these letters and the reason they are written.

Mr. Chairman, it has been argued that some portions of this bill should have been assigned to the Civil Service and Post Office Committee and yet other portions to the Judiciary Committee and even other parts to the House Administration Committee. It seems to me these arguments are valid. Certainly, the Judiciary Committee should have considered the salaries of Federal judges and if the House Administration Committee has jurisdiction over other expenses or allowances of the legislative branch then it would seem to me it would be the appropriate committee to consider title II of this bill. But to whatever committee this bill had been referred, congressional salaries should not be considered as part and parcel in the same bill with postal workers and other personnel in the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of this debate, there have been statements made about how our constituents feel about this pay increase for Members of Congress. Well, I do not know about other Members but I have not received a single piece of correspondence from any individual or group supporting the congressional pay increase that did not in the same letter ask for support for another provision in the bill. There is nothing wrong in such correspondence. I simply mention it to point out that not a single letter has come from a disinterested source saying that Members of Congress should receive $10,000 a year increase. All of the resolutions of the American Bar Association approving congressional pay raises, in these same resolutions asked Members to be for increases for the Federal judiciary. I repeat, this is to be expected but it shows there is no one in favor of congressional pay increase outside the circle of those who hope to receive some benefit from another provision in the bill.

On the other side of the issue, I wish to report I recently mailed out about 30,000 questionnaires and although the proposition of compensation increases for employees and Members of Congress was not mentioned as a question, nonetheless, we received handwritten notations in hundreds of instances expressing opposition to congressional pay raises in the amounts that had been discussed in the press back during the latter part of January in the amounts proposed in this bill today. These letters were from persons whose opinions had been solicited on such things as Presidential succession, voluntary prayer, foreign aid, and civil rights. The opinions expressed on pay increases were sent in unsolicited by our constituents. It showed very clearly they were opposed to pay increases for Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I could support a small increase in congressional pay not greater than an amount equal to the rise of the cost of living since the last increase of 1955 and even provide for a reasonable number of trips to and from the home district. This I think would be accepted by our constituents. If it is possible to separate the congressional pay from these other raises, we will have no problem. That is the reason I support the Cunningham amendment and associate myself with the arguments for the Cunningham amendment by the other Members.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, these amendments should be defeated. They are illustrative of the fact that if you try to make adjustments in any part of this bill without reference to other parts as well you are going to get into all kinds of inequities. Therefore, I believe that an amendment to reduce these salaries has to apply to all three titles or it is not going to be worthwhile. If we pass one and not the other, we are clear out of kilter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] to close debate.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, as appears from the other arguments that have been made, this is a bad amendment. I ask that it be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CUNNINGHAM) there were—ayes 37, noes 125.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OLSEN OF MONTANA

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Page 35, strike out line 14 and all that follows down through the period on line 14 on page 38 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1964'.

"SEC. 202. (a) The gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law) in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be increased by the greater of the following amounts, as applicable:

"(1) an amount equal to 3½ per centum of such gross rate plus 1 per centum of such gross rate for each whole multiple, or part of a multiple, of $500 basic compensation; or

"(2) an amount equal to 5 per centum of such gross rate.

"(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this title, shall be increased by an amount which is equal to the amount of the increase provided by subsection (a) of this section in that gross rate which is nearest in amount to the total annual compensation of such officer or employee.

"(c) Each of the limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives shall be increased by 7 per centum. The amount of each increase under this subsection shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent."

And on pages 38 and 39 redesignate subsections (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. STINSON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] is recognized.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, the language now contained in H.R. 8986 which would provide salary adjustments for our legislative employees has become technically imperfect due to the passage of time and due to adjustments that have occurred in pay schedules over a period of time.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. This is a clarifying amendment and Members on this side will accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Where you have here on this first increase—"an amount equal to 3½ per centum of such gross rate"—I can understand that—

Plus 1 per centum of such gross rate for each whole multiple or part of a multiple of $500 basic compensation.

Now if a person had basic compensation of $4,000 that would be an 8-percent increase; is that correct? Plus the 3½ percent would be 11½-percent increase; is that correct?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. That would be correct.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What would be the maximum amount of basic compensation of any employee who would be affected by section 202(a)?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. The maximum base compensation of anybody affected by this would be $9,475.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In other words, that would be a 23-percent increase for the person with that basic amount?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. It would mean it would be a little over 18 percent and it would mean that the person who now has a gross pay of $20,000 would be getting approximately $24,000.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. Is this not just an amendment to give the legislative workers the same increase as the classified workers in the same levels?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. That is exactly what it does and the percentage has been worked out to make it exactly equal to what the classified employees are getting in title I.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, let me see if I can get this straight, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Montana. I assume this means that an employee on your staff or on my staff, getting $7,000 base and being paid $15,349 at present, under the terms of this would go to $18,035; is that correct? Am I working on the right table?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. You are working on the correct table. Of course, I must say it is in these brackets that you are speaking of, in the higher brackets where the major changes occur in the calculation because of the great timelag that has occurred in making increases in salaries for the higher brackets of the classified, postal, and legislative workers and we are trying to do it all uniformly.

Mr. GROSS. At the other end of the Capitol, in the other body, does the gentleman know the average pay of an administrative assistant, as they are called over there?

Would that be $19,000, $20,000, or what?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. It would be about $19,000. The gross would be more than $22,000 in the other body now.

Mr. GROSS. If I have the correct table, it would be about $23,000.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. $22,945.

Mr. GROSS. So if we consider the office formerly held there by one Bobby Baker, and paid $19,600 a year, if he were still operating out of the other side of the Capitol, he would get up to $23,000 or $24,000, would he not?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. About $23,400.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently he would not need this increase if he were still there, because he managed to put together a fortune of a couple of million dollars.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I do not have any ideas about anything except what is of record.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that the legislative employees on this side of the Capitol are not indulging in some of the Baker manipulations. Does the gentleman not believe this is a pretty healthy schedule of increases?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. As I said, the increase is to give the legislative employees on the Hill a comparable increase to that to be enjoyed by the classified services and the postal services, in the same comparable levels.

Mr. GROSS. In the same comparable levels?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know exactly how to regard this comparability business. Before our committee the other day we heard testimony from the Civil Service Commission that the difference

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

in the cost of living as between Houston, Tex., and Chicago, Ill., was 22 percent. I wish someone would tell me how it is proposed to arrive at any kind of a true measure of comparability in fixing salaries when within the continental limits of the United States there is a 22-percent spread in cost of living as between cities.

I believe the increases proposed in the amendment are unacceptable and I am opposed.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on a time limitation for debate on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that debate end in 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORRISON. I move that debate end in 5 minutes on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] for 1 minute.

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this omnibus pay raise bill. While there are unquestionably instances where the pay of government workers should be raised, I cannot take the whole "package deal" that has been sent to us by the administration and the House leadership.

Employees of the executive department, postal workers, other branches of civil service, the judiciary and congressional employees should all be considered separately and on their individual merits.

Congress is being asked to raise its own pay by 44 percent, and this raise is to take place not after the voters have had an opportunity to select new Members of Congress, but those of us who are now sitting in Congress are asked to raise our own salaries by 44 percent this year which amounts to $10,000 per year, in the term which we are now serving.

All members of the civil service are not treated so well. A GS-1, drawing $3,305 per year, is given an increase of 2.4 percent, a total of $80 per year. The upper echelon of Government service are to receive increases from 40 to 47 percent, amounting to from $7,500 to $10,000 per year.

I will be very happy to study and vote on pay raises for the various segments of our Government employees on their respective merits, but I cannot in good conscience support this legislation.

I also want to assure this body that I will do my best to see that there is a roll-call vote on this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, how do you like the steamroller tactics?

I hope, if I can get the answer in 1 minute——

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I will answer. We like it fine.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I will not yield at all.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if there is now in the bill before us an effective date for the salary increase for Members of Congress; and, if so, what it is.

Mr. MURRAY. It would apply on January 1, 1964.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would like to ask the chairman, the ranking majority member and the ranking minority member, if we can have at this time their assurance that if this effective date is changed to July 1 of this year by the other body, they will stand firm in conference for a January 1, 1965, date for congressional pay increases.

Mr. MORRISON. Will you vote for this bill?

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman's question is irrelevant entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I will ask the question again later until I get an answer.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the gentleman's question and then yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

I would like to say to the gentleman that his question is not properly put. The effective date in this bill is January 1, 1964, but there has to be some change in that because that date has passed.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I appreciate the gentleman's answering that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

The passage of time since last November, when this bill was reported from the committe, has made the language contained in the bill providing salary increases to legislative employees unworkable. The new language which is proposed to be substituted in the bill for legislative employees will provide a workable formula under which these employees will receive salary adjustments comparable to those which will be given to their counterparts who are covered by the Classification Act. In other words, what is proposed here is that our legislative employees receive raises in a similar amount—no more and no less—to those given employees who are employed in the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, for reasons beyond my comprehension there exists among some of my colleagues a tendency to downgrade our own employees, and to either overlook them entirely when pay adjustments are given to all other Federal employees, or to treat them less equitably than we do other employees.

This is a rather incongruous situation since it exists at a time when increasing emphasis is being given to the need for the proper staffing of the Congress. A number of national publications have recently carried articles pointing out how very important it is to the national welfare that the Congress have available to it the best available technical assistance it can secure. As most of you know, the American Political Science Association has recognized the necessity of maintaining the highest possible degree of skill and knowledge among congressional staff assistants and for this purpose it is now awarding a series of liberal congressional fellowships. Certainly, if by modernizing our Federal salary structure we are to give the executive branch the means whereby it can recruit and retain competent personnel, we can do no less for the legislative branch.

When we tend to downgrade or neglect our own employees, we should also keep in mind that they work under conditions that are already vastly inferior to their counterparts in the executive branch.

Our legislative employees are without civil service status and the consequent armor of protection that such status affords. They have no guaranteed tenure, no appeals rights, and are not covered under numerous laws such as the veterans' perference law that grant protection and preference to employees in the executive branch. They are not covered under the overtime laws applicable to other Federal employees; they have no sick leave protection, and no system of annual leave.

Despite all of this, you will certainly find nowhere in the Government any group of employees who are generally more dedicated and who possess a higher degree of competence than you will find here at the Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support this amendment and I hope that it is adopted unanimously as a vote of confidence for a group of Federal workers who have for too long not received the recognition due them.

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make an explanation that a ranking member of the committee proposed an amendment changing the effective date from January 1, 1964, to after the enactment of this legislation. The bill calls for January 1, 1964, now. An amendment will be made to change that so that the effective date will be after the enactment of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on title II and all amendments thereto end in 10 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I inquire how many amendments there are at the desk to title II?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reports there are three amendments.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on title II and all amendments thereto end in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in doubt as to the meaning of the gentle-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

man's motion. Will the gentleman please repeat it?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes. I just changed from 10 to 15 minutes the time limit on this section.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands it, you have moved that all debate on this title and all amendments thereto cease in 15 minutes.

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JOHANSEN and Mr. MORRISON.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were ayes 159, noes 64.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON] for 1½ minutes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OLIVER P. BOLTON

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON on page 40, immediately following line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 203. Section 117 of the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 837; 31 U.S.C. 67) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) Except as otherwise provided by law, the Comptroller General in auditing the financial transactions of the House of Representatives and of the Architect of the Capitol shall make such audits at such times as he may deem appropriate. For the purpose of conducting such audits, the provisions of section 313 of the Budget and Accounting Act (42 Stat. 26; 31 U.S.C. 54) shall be applicable to the legislative agencies under audit. The Comptroller General shall report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives the results of each such audit relating to the financial transactions of the House of Representatives, and shall report also to the Architect of the Capitol the results of the audit of his office. All such reports, including the reports required by the Act of July 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 482), shall be printed as House Documents.'"

And redesignate sections 203 and 204 on pages 40 and 41 as sections 204 and 205, respectively.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not germane and has nothing to do with pay raises. It was not discussed in our committee. It covers a subject completely outside the provisions of the bill. It is not contemplated within the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Actually, I am surprised that the germaneness of the amendment would be raised. The bill deals with the salary of the Members of the House. My amendment would go toward the accounting for those expenditures of the House which if they were not expended by the House would well be considered salary, such as, if I may list a few: Travel for staffs and for members of committees, investigations made by members of committees, appropriations of the House for office furniture for rugs, and so forth, appropriated funds used to pay for stationery allowances, appropriated funds made for office rental at home.

In addition I would point out to the Chairman that this is germane to the bill because it is an accounting measure. Also that in 1922 with reference to a similar measure the specific question was raised as to the germaneness of an accounting and disclosure bill amendment. If the members of the committee will look at volume 65, part 10, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 3, 1924, they will note that the House had under consideration S. 1898, a bill for reclassification of the salaries of postmasters and employees of the postal service.

The question was raised as to whether or not a bill requiring Members to disclose campaign contributions would be in order. A long parliamentary discussion ensued. The Senate bill was not recognized, and the House Speaker recognized that the amendment specifically was a House amendment and was ruled to be germane to the postal bill.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, therefore, this is a precedent; but I do not rely wholly on the precedent. I would respectfully state to the Chair this is intimately connected with the pay, either direct or indirect, of Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair has listened to the arguments made by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Louisiana.

The subject matter of the pending bill pertains to salaries of various governmental employees and not to accounting. The amendment that the gentleman from Ohio offers is, in effect, the same as a bill which he has introduced that was referred to the Committee on Government Operations. The subject matter of the bill and of the gentleman's amendment pertains to accounting, which comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations and not under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

On previous occasions the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], while presiding in a Committee of the Whole, have ruled that such subject matter as the gentleman presents is not germane. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 41, immediately following line 10, insert the following:

"SEC. 205(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and in recognition of the fact that the duties and responsibilities of a Member of Congress are conducted on a full-time basis, there shall be deducted from the compensation in any year of each Senator, Representative in Congress, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico an amount equal to the amount of compensation which such official has received for personal services from other sources during such year up to the amount of any increase provided in this Act. Personal services shall be deemed to include any personal service performed by the individual for which he receives a salary, commission, fee, retainer, honorarium, per diem, or any other compensation received in return for rendering such personal service, but shall not include dividends, interest, rentals, pensions, disability benefits, insurance, retirement income, or any other form of income which is not predicated upon the rendering of any personal service."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the ground it puts upon the Disbursing Office of the Congress duties that are not contemplated in this act, and duties he would be unable to perform in trying to ascertain all the other things that are mentioned in this amendment in the way of income.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is germane. It is based upon the fact that the salary of a Member of Congress is for a full-time job. That is the argument that has been advanced for increasing the salary of a Member of Congress. If we are paying for a full-time job, then we ought to get a full-time Member to fill that job. However, I would not require any Member to devote his full time, if he wants to practice law, if he wants to practice medicine, if he wants to practice any other profession for which he will receive an income. Presumably he would have to be absent from the body here before he could get that income. He would merely report that income, which he would have to do on his income tax anyway, and tell the Clerk he had received $10,000 additional income; that he was not entitled to the full salary.

I have the greatest sympathy for the man who has no other income, who is trying to raise a family. Even the $35,000 would be inadequate. But for people who have outside income, and I have a little outside income, they would come under the provisions of this act. I am not trying to take advantage of anyone else, but if I do not give my full time to the job, I should not be paid for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is talking to the merits of the amendment. Will he please confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I will be glad to get back to the point of order. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for getting me this extra time.

I say it would not impose any great duty on the disbursing office. This amendment is predicated on a full-time

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

job. If a Member does not want to give a full-time job, he can so indicate to the disbursing office up to $10,000. He is required to report that on the income tax, anyway. It would be a very simple operation. I think everybody would be happy. I do not know of anybody who wants to take their time away here and have the Government pay them for the time they are practicing law or practicing medicine.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and ask that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] pertains to the bill under discussion, which refers to matters concerned with the salaries of Federal officers and employees. The Chair has listened carefully to the argument of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] and the gentleman from Missouri, and the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 28, noes 132.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROCK

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROCK: On page 41, line 11, amend section 204 by adding a new subsection, Subsection (B) to read as follows:

"(b) As of July 1 of every year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall ascertain and certify to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate the amount of the increase or decrease in the public debt as compared with the public debt on the preceding July 1, with the amount of such increase or decrease rounded off to the nearest $100,000,000 and counting $50,000,000 or more as $100,000,000. Effective January 1 of the calendar year next succeeding each certification by the Secretary of the Treasury under this paragraph, the rate of compensation set forth in subsection (a) of this section shall be adjusted as follows:

"(A) Such rate of compensation shall be increased at the rate of 1 per centum per annum for each $1,000,000,000 by which the public debt was decreased, as certified by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(B) Such rate of compensation shall be decreased at the rate of 1 per centum per annum for each $1,000,000,000 by which the public debt was increased, as certified by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Whenever the amount of the increase or decrease in the public debt certified by the Secretary of the Treasury contains an amount which is a fractional part of $1,000,000,000, the adjustment of such rate of compensation under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be, or shall include, as the case may be, an amount which bears the same ratio to 1 per centum of such rate of compensation as the fractional amount of such increase or decrease bears to $1,000,000,000."

(Mr. BROCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to this title or to this bill. The subject matter of the amendment is obviously one within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, we have in section 204 on page 41 offered an amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act, United States Code 31. This amendment applies to that particular act and is an addition to that section. It would simply add an additional subsection; therefore, I think it is germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair has listened carefully to the arguments of the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee clearly sets forth additional tests and duties which are not contemplated in the original act. Therefore, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WATSON

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATSON: Page 41, line 3, insert "(a)" immediately following "SEC. 204."

And on page 41, immediately following line 10, insert the following:

"(b) The increases in compensation provided by the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall not be effective for any fiscal year immediately following a fiscal year in which the total revenues of the Government of the United States are less than the total expenditures of such Government, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment, and I am sure it needs no explanation. Earlier during the general debate, I believe one of our colleagues suggested he was going to offer an amendment predicating all of the salary increases on the balancing of the budget. I do not think that is fair because the classified and postal employees do not have the primary responsibility for balancing the budget. That is our responsibility. For those who believe in a balanced budget, this is your opportunity to put your money where your mouth is.

Mr. Chairman, if we provide for these increases regardless of a balanced budget, how are we ever going to balance the budget?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Did you offer this amendment to the public works bill?

Mr. WATSON. I did not.

Mr. HAYS. You had some projects in that bill; did you not?

Mr. WATSON. There were many projects throughout the United States, and the gentleman knows the public works bill did not include any salary increases for the Congress. Therefore, a similar amendment was not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—FEDERAL EXECUTIVE SALARIES

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Executive Salary Act of 1963".

SEC. 302. There is hereby established for offices and positions to which section 303 of this title applies a basic compensation schedule, to be known as the "Federal Executive Salary Schedule", which shall be divided into six salary levels.

SEC. 303. (a) Level I of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $35,000:

(1) Secretary of State.
(2) Secretary of the Treasury.
(3) Secretary of Defense.
(4) Attorney General.
(5) Postmaster General.
(6) Secretary of the Interior.
(7) Secretary of Agriculture.
(8) Secretary of Commerce.
(9) Secretary of Labor.
(10) Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) Level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $32,500:

(1) Deputy Secretary of Defense.
(2) Under Secretary of State.
(3) Administrator, Agency for International Development.
(4) Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
(5) Director of the Bureau of the Budget.
(6) Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
(7) Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
(8) Director of the United States Information Agency.
(9) Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

(c) Level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule shall apply to the following offices and positions, for which the annual rate of basic compensation shall be $30,500:

(1) Deputy Attorney General.
(2) Deputy Postmaster General.
(3) Under Secretary of Agriculture.
(4) Under Secretary of Commerce.
(5) Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.
(6) Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.
(7) Under Secretary of the Interior.
(8) Under Secretary of Labor.
(9) Under Secretary of State, Political Affairs.
(10) Under Secretary of the Treasury.
(11) Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.
(12) Secretary of the Air Force.
(13) Secretary of the Army.
(14) Secretary of the Navy.
(15) Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.
(16) Administrator of General Services.
(17) Administrator of the Small Business Administration.
(18) Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
(19) Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development.
(20) Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.
(21) Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

(22) Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission.

(23) Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

(24) Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

(25) Chairman, Board of Directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

(26) Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

(27) Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission.

(28) Chairman, Federal Power Commission.

(29) Chairman, Federal Trade Commission.

(30) Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission.

(31) Chairman, National Labor Relations Board.

(32) Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.

(33) Chairman, Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

(34) Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense.

(35) Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

(36) Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(37) Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(38) Director of Central Intelligence.

(39) Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

(40) Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

(41) Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

(42) Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

(d) The President is authorized from time to time to place offices and positions in levels IV, V, and VI of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule in accordance with subsections (e), (f), and (g) of this section. Each such action shall be published in the Federal Register, except when it is determined by the President that such publication would be contrary to the interest of national security.

(e) Offices and positions which the President is authorized to place in level IV include assistant secretaries of executive and military departments, general counsels of executive departments, members of regulatory boards and commissions, deputy heads of large agencies, heads of certain agencies and bureaus, and such other offices and positions the duties and responsibilities of which he deems appropriate for this level. The annual rate of basic compensation of such offices and positions shall be $29,500.

(f) Offices and positions which the President is authorized to place in level V include heads of principal services and such other offices and positions the duties and responsibilities of which he deems appropriate for this level. The annual rate of basic compensation of such offices and positions shall be $28,000.

(g) Offices and positions which the President is authorized to place in level VI include heads and board members of smaller agencies, deputy heads of other agencies, and such other offices and positions the duties and responsibilities of which he deems appropriate for this level. The annual rate of basic compensation for such offices and positions shall be $26,500.

SEC. 304. (a) Section 104 of title 3, United States Code (relating to the compensation of the Vice President), is amended by striking out "$35,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$45,000".

(b) Section 105 of title 3, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 105. Compensation of secretaries and executive administrative, and staff assistants to President

"The President is authorized to fix the compensation of the six administrative assistants authorized to be appointed under section 106 of this title, of the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, and of eight other secretaries or other immediate staff assistants in the White House Office at rates of compensation not to exceed that of level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.".

Conforming changes in existing law

SEC. 305. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) The Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2201–2209), establishing rates of basic compensation for heads of executive departments and other Federal officials.

(2) Section 3012(h) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Army.

(3) Section 3013(b) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the annual salaries of the Under Secretary and each Assistant Secretary of the Army at $20,000 a year.

(4) Section 5031(d) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Navy.

(5) Section 5033(c) of title 10, United States Code, providing the annual salary of $20,000 a year for the Under Secretary of the Navy.

(6) Section 304 of Public Law 87-651, approved September 7, 1962 (76 Stat. 526), providing compensation of $20,000 a year for Assistant Secretaries of the Navy.

(7) Section 8012(g) of title 10, United States Code, providing compensation of $22,000 a year for the Secretary of the Air Force.

(8) Section 8013(b) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the annual salaries of the Under Secretary and each Assistant Secretary of the Air Force at $20,000 a year.

(9) Section 137(c) of title 10, United States Code, fixing the compensation of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense at the rate prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments.

(10)(A) The last sentence of section 22 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 924; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2032(a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of such Commission, which reads: "Each member, except the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 per annum; and the member designated as Chairman shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 27 a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2037(a)), relating to the salary of the Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for an Assistant Secretary of Defense".

(11) That part of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1958 (72 Stat. 1799 and 861; 75 Stat. 630; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15 note)—

(A) In section 2(b), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments";

(B) In section 2(c), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Director of such Office, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the under secretaries referred to in section 104 of the Fedeal Executive Pay Act of 1956 (5 U.S.C. 2203).,"; and

(C) In section 2(d) relating to the annual salaries of three Assistant Directors of such Office, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments,".

(12) (A) That part of the second sentence of section 202(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2472(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 202(b) of such Act (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2472(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Administration, which reads: ", shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,500 per annum.".

(13)(A) That part of section 201(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)), relating to the annual salary of a civilian executive secretary in the National Aeronautics and Space Council, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 a year".

(B) That part of section 204 of such Act (72 Stat. 431; 42 U.S.C. 2474 (a)(1) and (d)), relating to the annual salary of the Chairman of the Civilian-Military Liaison Committee, as follows:

In subsection (a)(1), that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation (in the manner provided in subsection (d)) at the rate of $20,000 per annum".

In the second sentence of subsection (d), that part which reads: "fixed by subsection (a)(1)".

(14) That part of the second sentence of section 2(b) of the Act of May 26, 1949, as amended (73 Stat. 265; 5 U.S.C. 151b(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs or for Economic Affairs, as designated by the President, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,000 a year and".

(15) The last sentence of section 210(a) of title 38, United States Code, relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans' Administration, which reads: "He shall receive a salary of $21,000 a year, payable monthly.".

(16)(A) The last sentence of section 201 (a)(2) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 741; 49 U.S.C. 1321(a)(2)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which reads: "Each member of the Board shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum, except that the members serving as Chairman shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,500 per annum.".

(B) That part of the second sentence of section 301(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 744; 49 U.S.C. 1341(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum".

(C) That part of the second sentence of section 302(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 744; 49 U.S.C. 1342(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Agency, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum, and".

(17)(A) The last sentence of section 22 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (75 Stat. 632; 50 U.S.C. 1522), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which reads: "He shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.".

(B) The second sentence of section 23 of such Act (75 Stat. 632; 50 U.S.C. 1523), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Director of such Agency, which reads: "He shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,500 per annum.".

(C) The second sentence of section 24 of such Act (75 Stat. 632; 50 U.S.C. 1524), re-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

lating to the annual salaries of the four Assistant Directors of such Agency, which reads: "They shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum.".

(18) Section 3 of the Act of March 2, 1955 (69 Stat. 10; U.S.C. 294, 293, 295a), relating to the annual salaries of certain officials of the Department of Justice, which reads:

"SEC. 3. (a) The compensation of the Deputy Attorney General shall be at the rate of $21,000 per annum.

"(b) The compensation of the Solicitor General shall be at the rate of $20,500 per annum.

"(c) The compensation of each Assistant Attorney General, other than the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, shall be at the rate of $20,000 per annum.".

(19)(A) The last sentence of section 102 (c) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 7 of 1961 (75 Stat. 840; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and members of the Federal Maritime Commission, which reads: "The Chairman of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,500 per annum, and each of the other Commissioners shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum.".

(B) That part of section 201 of such reorganization plan (75 Stat. 842; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15, note), relating to the annual salary of the Maritime Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 per annum,".

(20) That part of the fourth sentence of section 4(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (74 Stat. 408 and 913; 15 U.S.C. 78d (a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Chairman and Commissioners of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which reads: "shall receive a salary at the rate of $20,000 a year, except that the Chairman shall receive additional salary at the rate of $500 a year and".

(21) Section 8 of the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 (72 Stat. 1789; 5 U.S.C. 2205, note), fixing the annual salary of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs at $20,000 per annum.

(22) That part of the first sentence of section 3 of the Area Redevelopment Act (75 Stat. 48; 42 U.S.C. 2502), relating to the annual salary of the Area Redevelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce".

(23) The last sentence of section 203(b)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (72 Stat. 520; 5 U.S.C. 171c(b)(1)), relating to the annual salary of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering in the Department of Defense, which reads: "The compensation of the Director is that prescribed by law for the Secretaries of the military departments.".

(24) In section 303(a) of title 23, United States Code,

(A) That part of the second sentence, relating to the annual salary of the Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "shall receive basic compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments and"; and

(B) The last sentence, relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Federal Highway Administrator in such department, which reads: "The Deputy Federal Highway Administrator shall receive basic compensation at a rate $1,000 less than the rate provided for the Federal Highway Administrator.".

(25) The last proviso in the paragraph under the heading "IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE" and under the subheading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 251; 5 U.S.C. 2206 note), relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which reads: ": *Provided further,* That, hereafter, the compensation of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be $20,000 per annum".

(26) The second paragraph of section 3 of title 35, United States Code, relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of Patents which reads: "The annual rate of compensation of the Commissioner shall be $20,000."

(27) That part of section 4(a) of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612; 22 U.S.C. 2503(a)), relating to the annual salaries of the Director and of the Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, which reads: ", whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $20,000 per annum," and ", whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $19,500 per annum".

(28) Section 308 of title 39, United States Code, fixing the annual rate of basic compensation of the position of Chief Postal Inspector in the Post Office Department at $19,000.

(29) That part of the first sentence of section 4 of the International Travel Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 130; 22 U.S.C. 2124), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the United States Travel Service in the Department of Commerce, which reads: "who shall be compensated at the rate of $19,000 per annum,".

(30) Section 14(b) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 716; 5 U.S.C. 3013(b)) which fixes the compensation of the Executive Director of the United States Civil Service Commission at $19,000 per annum.

(31) That part of the first sentence of section 107(c) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (73 Stat. 211; 50 U.S.C. App. 1217(c)), relating to the annual salary of the General Counsel of the Renegotiation Board, which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at the rate of $19,000 per annum".

(32)(A) That part of the third sentence in section 201(a) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 538; 40 U.S.C. 661(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency, which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the maximum rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, plus $500 per annum".

(B) That part of the first sentence of section 201(b) of such Act (74 Stat. 538; 40 U.S.C. 661(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy Administrator of such Agency, which reads: ", and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to the maximum rate for grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(33) The last sentence of section 624(e)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 447; 22 U.S.C. 2384(d)(1)), as amended, fixing the compensation of certain officials in the Department of State, which reads: "The Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 annually; the Deputy Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $19,500 annually, and each Assistant Inspector General, Foreign Assistance, shall receive compensation at the rate of $19,000 annually.".

(34) That part of section 202 of the Act of July 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 305; 5 U.S.C. 623g), relating to the annual salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, which reads: ", and whose annual rate of basic compensation shall be $19,000".

(35) That part of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1963, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR" and under the caption "BUREAU OF RECLAMATION" and the subheading "ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS" (76 Stat. 1223; 43 U.S.C. 373a–1), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, which reads:

"After September 30, 1962, the position of Commissioner of Reclamation shall have the annual rate of compensation as provided for positions listed in section 2205(a) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent.".

(36) That part of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1962, under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR" and under the caption "BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION" and the subheading "CONSTRUCTION" (75 Stat. 728; 16 U.S.C. 832a–1), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, which reads:

"After October 1, 1961, the position of Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, shall have the same annual rate of compensation as that provided for positions listed in section 2205(b) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent.".

(37) Section 205 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 423; 5 U.S.C. 483–1 note, 2206 note), as amended, relating to the salary of the present incumbent of the position of Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the Department of the Interior, and to the salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of such Department, which reads:

"SEC. 205. After August 31, 1957, the salary of the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration shall be the same as the salary of the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, so long as held by the present incumbent; and the salary of the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Department shall be the same as the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.".

(38) The proviso in the first paragraph under the heading "FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION" and under the subheading "SALARIES AND EXPENSES" in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1963 (76 Stat. 1087; Public Law 87–843), relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which reads: ": *Provided,* That the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be $22,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent" and provisions to the same effect contained in other appropriation Acts enacted prior to the effective date of this section relating to the annual salary of the present incumbent of the position of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(39) That part of section 7801(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, relating to the annual salary of the Assistant General Counsel of the Treasury Department who shall be the Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, which reads: "and shall receive basic compensation at the annual rate of $19,000".

(40)(A) Sections 3018, 5014, and 8018 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the general counsels of the military departments.

(B) The respective tables of contents of chapters 303, 503, and 803 of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking out

"3018. Compensation of General Counsel.";
"5014. Compensation of General Counsel."; and
"8018. Compensation of General Counsel.".

(41) The proviso contained in the first sentence of section 5(d) of the Farm Credit Act of 1953, as amended (75 Stat. 793; 12 U.S.C. 636d(d)), relating to the annual salaries for not more than three positions of deputy governor in the Farm Credit Administration, which reads: ": *Provided,* That the salary of not more than three positions of deputy governor each shall be fixed by the Board at a rate not exceeding the maximum scheduled

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

rate of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended".

(42)(A) That part of section 2(a) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1962 (76 Stat. 1253; 5 U.S.C. 133z note), relating to the compensation of the Director of the Office of Science and Technology, which reads: "and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum".

(B) That part of section 2(b) of such reorganization plan (76 Stat. 1253; 5 U.S.C. 133z note), relating to the compensation of the Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology, which reads: "and receive compensation at the rate of $20,500 per annum".

(C) That part of section 22(a) of such reorganization plan (76 Stat. 1255; 5 U.S.C. 133z note), relating to the compensation of the Director of the National Science Foundation, which reads: "shall receive compensation at the rate of $21,000 per annum and".

(43) That part of section 624(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 447; 22 U.S.C. 2384(a)), relating to the compensation of twelve officers in the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of such Act, which reads: "of whom—

"(1) one shall have the rank of an Under Secretary and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Under Secretary of an Executive Department;

"(2) two shall have the rank of Deputy Under Secretaries and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Deputy Under Secretary of an Executive Department; and

"(3) nine shall have the rank of Assistant Secretaries and shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate authorized by law for any Assistant Secretary of an Executive Department,".

(44) That part of the first sentence of section 104(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 174; 8 U.S.C. 1104(b)), relating to the rank and compensation of the Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, which reads: "and compensation".

SEC. 306. (a) Section 508 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 508. Salaries

"The Attorney General shall fix the annual salaries of the positions of United States attorneys, assistant United States attorneys, and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title at rates of compensation not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.".

(b) Section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (70 Stat. 704; 22 U.S.C. 866), relating to the per annum salaries of chiefs of mission, is amended by striking out the second sentence of that section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The per annum salaries of chiefs of mission within each class shall be at the rate provided by law for the levels of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule as follows: class 1, the rate for level II; class 2, the rate for level III; class 3, the rate for level IV; and class 4, the rate for level V.".

(c) That part of section 201(f) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 428; 42 U.S.C. 2471(f)), fixing a limit of $19,000 on the compensation of seven persons in the National Aeronautics and Space Council, is amended by striking out "compensated at the rate of not more than $19,000 a year," and inserting in lieu thereof "compensated at not to exceed the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 as amended,".

(d) Clause (A) of section 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "(A) to the extent the Administrator deems such action necessary to the discharge of his responsibilities, he may appoint not more than four hundred and twenty-five of the scientific, engineering, and administrative personnel of the Administration without regard to such laws, and may fix the compensation of such personnel not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and".

(e) Section 6(f) of the Act of September 24, 1959 (73 Stat. 706; 5 U.S.C. 2376(f)), relating to the maximum compensation payable to employees of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, is amended by striking out "at a rate in excess of $20,000 per annum" and by inserting in lieu thereof "at a rate in excess of the rate provided by law for level VI of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule".

(f) The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) In the last sentence of section 24 a. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(a)), relating to the annual salary of the General Manager of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $22,000 per annum";

(2) In the last sentence of section 24 b. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(b)), relating to the annual salary of the Deputy General Manager of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $20,500 per annum";

(3) In the last sentence of section 24 c. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2034(c)), relating to the annual salaries of the Assistant General Managers (or their equivalents) of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $20,000 per annum";

(4) In the second sentence of section 25 a. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(a)), relating to the annual salaries of directors of program divisions of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum";

(5) In section 25 b. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(b)), relating to the annual salary of the General Counsel of such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,500 per annum";

(6) In the first sentence of section 25 c. (68 Stat. 925; 71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(c)), relating to the annual salary of the Director of the Inspection Division in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: "and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the Commission, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum";

(7) In the last sentence of section 25 d. (71 Stat. 612; 42 U.S.C. 2035(a)), relating to the annual salaries of certain executive management positions in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads: ", and shall receive compensation at a rate determined by the General Manager, but not in excess of $19,000 per annum"; and

(8) In the second sentence of section 28 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2038), relating to the compensation of the active member of the Armed Forces serving as Director of the Division of Military Application in such Commission, by striking out that part which reads "and the compensation prescribed in section 25" and inserting in lieu thereof, "and the compensation for directors of other program divisions".

(g) Section 2 of the Act of July 30, 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 712; 70 Stat. 740; 22 U.S.C. 287n), relating to the compensation of the United States representatives and alternates at sessions of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, is amended by striking out "Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at such rates, not to exceed $15,000 per annum, as the President may determine," and inserting in lieu thereof "Such representatives and alternates shall each be entitled to receive compensation at such rates provided by section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, as the President may determine,".

(h) Section 2 of the Act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 215; 22 U.S.C. 289a), relating to the compensation of the United States representatives and alternates at sessions of the general council and at sessions of the executive committee of the International Refugee Organization, is amended by striking out "Such representative or representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum, and any such alternate shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $10,000 per annum," and inserting in lieu thereof "Such representative or representatives, and any such alternate, shall be entitled to receive compensation at one of the rates provided by section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended,".

(i) The third sentence of section 2 of the Act of May 29, 1959 (73 Stat. 63; 50 U.S.C. 402 note), is amended to read as follows: "Except as provided in subsection (d) of section 203 of this Act, no officer or employee of the National Security Agency shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of the highest rate of basic compensation contained in such General Schedule.".

(j) Section 2 of the Act of July 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 414; D.C. Code, sec. 1–204b), relating to the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is amended by striking out "at the rate of $19,000 each per annum" and inserting "at the rate provided by law for level VI of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.".

(k) (1) The catchline of section 3012 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(2) The table of contents of chapter 303 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"3012. Secretary of the Army: powers and duties; delegation by; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"3012. Secretary of the Army: powers and and duties; delegation by.".

(3) The catchline of section 5031 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(4) The table of contents of chapter 505 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"5031. Secretary of the Navy: responsibilities; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"5031. Secretary of the Navy: responsibilities.".

(5) The catchline of section 5033 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(6) The table of contents of chapter 505 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

"5033. Under Secretary of the Navy: appointment; duties; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"5033. Under Secretary of the Navy: appointment; duties.".

(7) The catchline of section 8012 of such title 10 is amended by striking out "; compensation".

(8) The table of contents of chapter 803 of such title 10 is amended by striking out

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers and duties; delegation by; compensation."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"8012. Secretary of the Air Force: powers and duties; delegation by.".

Changes in position titles

SEC. 307. Whenever reference is made in any law or reorganization plan to the—

Administrative Assistant Attorney General,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Labor,

Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, or

Administrative Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,

such reference shall be held and considered to mean the—

Assistant Attorney General for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Administration,

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Administraiton,

Assistant Secretary of Labor for Administration.

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Administration, or

Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Administration;

respectively.

Limitation on salaries fixed by administrative action

SEC. 308. Except as provided by this Act and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the head of any executive department, independent establishment, or agency in the executive branch who is authorized to fix by administrative action the annual rate of basic compensation for any position, officer, or employee shall not fix such rate in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to impair the authorities provided in the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended (50 U.S.C. 403a and following).

Positions placed under Classification Act of 1949

SEC. 309. Each office or position in the executive branch specifically referred to in, or covered by, any conforming change in law made by section 305 of this Act which is not placed in a level of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule pursuant to section 303 of this Act, shall be placed in the appropriate grade of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in accordance with the provisions of such Act.

Saving provisions

SEC. 310. (a) Except as provided by this Act, the changes in existing law made by this Act shall not affect any office or posithe existing immediately prior to the effective date of any such changes in existing law, the compensation attached to such office or position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his entitlement to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken in accordance with this Act or other law.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the rate of basic compensation received by any officer or employee immediately prior to the effective date of this Act shall not be reduced by reason of enactment of this Act.

Mr. MURRAY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the title be dispensed with, that it be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OLSEN OF MONTANA

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Page 41, line 13, strike out "1963" and insert in lieu thereof "1964"; And on page 43, immediately following line 3, insert the following:

"Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"Director of Central Intelligence.

"Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

And on page 44, immediately following "(18)" in line 7, insert the word "Deputy";

And on page 45, strike out lines 9 and 10 and redesignate accordingly the subparagraphs following line 10 on page 45.

And on page 45, immediately following "(38)" in line 14, insert the word "Deputy";

And on page 45, immediately following line 23, insert the following:

"Comptroller of the Currency.

"Commissioner of Internal Revenue."

And on page 58, line 8, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)";

And on page 68, line 23, strike out "203 of this Act" and insert in lieu thereof "303 of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964".

And on page 71, immediately before the period in line 24, insert ", in section 3 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831b), or in section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 481, relating to the Comptroller of the Currency)".

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, these are technical corrections to the bill, for the most part. In the several printed copies made of the bill there were some errors in the placing of the executive positions in the wrong level. For instance, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Director of Central Intelligence were included in level 2 of the administration approved bill with which we started. The committee bill now before us inadvertently placed them in level 3. The committee did not intend to reduce the ranking of these three positions. Under existing law, these positions are in the same level as most of the positions included in level 2 under H.R. 8986.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. These positions were inadvertently put in these grades and should have been put in the grades the amendment calls for. The committee members on this side will accept the amendment.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States can be rightfully proud of the system of internal revenue taxation that has carefully and deliberately evolved throughout the years. We, in the legislative branch, must share the successful role we have played in this evolution with the able and dedicated men who have accepted the burdens of the office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue. I know of few positions, within or outside Government, which are as complex, as difficult, or as responsible.

One of the most important responsibilities the Commissioner has is to foster and encourage a general attitude of taxpayer compliance with our tax laws and regulations. We have watched in our time the growth of a spirit of voluntary taxpayer compliance unmatched elsewhere in a free society. More than 97 percent of our tax revenues are the results of self-assessments by the taxpayers. From the standpoint of relative efficiency, no tax jurisdiction that I know of can match the continuing record of the Internal Revenue Service. Consistently, they have kept the costs of collecting our revenues down to much less than ½ cent per tax dollar. Without the spirit of fiscal integrity which we rely upon the Commissioner to foster and instill in our citizens, I cannot imagine the levels to which our costs of collection might grow.

I am moved to compare the efficiency and results achieved in this country to the tax collection efforts in other lands. We can be grateful for the caliber of men who have willingly accepted the responsibility to administer the tax laws we now live under.

It is my point in these remarks to offer a reminder that H.R. 8986 furnishes little recognition, indeed, for the job we have come to expect from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Under this bill, level IV is the highest level in the proposed Federal executive salary schedule that the President can assign to this job. This is a clear demotion of the Commissioner's position. I ask that the position be regarded as no less than level III in the legislation we finally enact.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OLSEN OF MONTANA

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Page 69, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(j)(1) Sections 2 and 3 of the Act of July 25, 1959 (72 Stat. 414; D.C. Code, secs. 1–204a and 1–204b), relating to the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, are amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided by this section and section 3 of this Act—

"'(1) the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $29,000 each per annum; and

"'(2) the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall receive an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section.

"'SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"'(1) the compensation of the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of $29,500 per annum; and

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

"(2) If the Commissioner detailed from the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army is chosen President of the Board of Commissioners, he shall receive, as President of the Board, an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized by paragraph (1) of this section."

"(2) Section 11-702(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 484; Public Law 88-241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, is amended—

"(A) by striking out '$19,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$28,000'; and

"(B) by striking out $18,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$27,500'.

(3) Section 11-902(d) of the District of Columbia Code (77 Stat. 487; Public Law 88-241), relating to the rates of annual salary of the chief judge and the associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, is amended—

"(A) by striking out '$18,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$26,500'; and

"(B) by striking out '$17,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$26,000'.

"(4) The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2402), relating to the compensation of the person appointed to the District of Columbia Tax Court, is amended by striking out '$17,500' and inserting in lieu thereof '$26,000'.

"(5) That part of the salary schedule in section 1 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (76 Stat. 1229; D.C. Code, sec. 31-1501), relating to the compensation of the Superintendent of Schools, and Deputy Superintendent of Schools, of the District of Columbia, which reads:

"'Class 1: Superintendent of Schools $19,000
Class 2: Deputy superintendent .. 16,500'

is amended to read as follows:

"Class 1: Superintendent of Schools $28,000
Class 2: Deputy superintendent .. 22,500'

"(6) That part of the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 480), as amended (SEC. 4-823, et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 edition) relating to the compensation of the Fire Chief and Chief of Police, which reads:

"'Class 10 ..... Fire Chief. Chief of Police."	$17,000	$17,400	$17,800	$18,200	.....	$18,600	$19,000'

is amended to read as follows:

"'Class 10 ..... Fire Chief. Chief of Police."	$21,000	$21,500	$22,000	$22,500	.....	$23,000	$23,500'

Mr. OLSEN of Montana (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to a most regrettable oversight in H.R. 8986. I refer to the omission from either level II or level III in section 303, of the position of Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Under the bill in its present form, the highest salary that the President could assign this position is level IV. Considering the positions listed in level II— and especially those shown in level III—this is not only a substantial demotion for this position, but a gross underestimate of the importance of the tax agency alongside the positions which the bill approves for higher levels.

Under the Executive Pay Act of 1956, in section 104(a), the position of Commissioner of Internal Revenue was shown at No. 1 in a salary range providing for a total of 20 positions. Eighteen of these positions—now paid on the same basis as the Commissioner—are assigned either to level II or level III of the proposed Federal Executive Salary Schedule. It was the judgment of Congress in 1956 that the position of Commissioner of Internal Revenue should be numbered among the most important and most difficult in the Federal Establishment. In my present judgment, the Commissioner's position should be maintained in this same leading category. I am strengthened in my conviction by the fact that at level III in the bill presently before us there can be identified 17 positions which hitherto have been paid at lower rates than the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Surely, it was never intended that these jobs were to be considered of superior scope and importance than the IRS position. But that is precisely what will come about unless the Commissioner's position is rightly restored to the relationship it had with the other positions under the 1956 Executive Pay Act.

Relative size and importance of agencies should have been given some consideration in the assignment of an appropriate salary level for the IRS position. In this connection, I note that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue heads an organization fully 2½ times as large as the largest of the agency head positions listed in level II. Moreover, level II includes both autonomous and semiautonomous agencies, the latter represented by the Administrator, Agency for International Development, a constituent bureau of the State Department. By the same reasoning that places this position in level II, it is my firm belief that the IRS position is no less than a level III job. This semiautonomous status of the Internal Revenue Service within the Treasury Department has been recognized in an interesting fashion by a White House document. In 1955, Foreign Operations Administration—one of the predecessors of the Agency for International Development—was changed by Executive Order No. 10610 from an independent agency to a part of the State Department. President Eisenhower at that time explained that the foreign aid agency would function within the Department of State in the same manner as Internal Revenue within the Treasury Department; that is, with internal autonomy for its operations, but subject to policy control and coordination by the Department.

The Administrator of the Agency for International Development within State Department like the Commissioner of Internal Revenue within Treasury Department, still operates with "superbureau" status. Since the H.R. 8986 recognizes level II for the AID job, I ask that no less than level III recognition be extended to the position of Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

PROPOSED PAY STATUS OF COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

This paper discusses the downward revision in the relative executive pay level of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as proposed in H.R. 8986.

First. The attached memorandum sets forth the effect of the bill on the relative ranking of the Commissioner within the executive branch.

Second. The relation of the Commissioner within the Treasury.

The positions of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue are relatively constant combinations of the duties and responsibilities, largely determined by statutory guidelines. On the other hand, the duties of the Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury are determined from time to time at the discretion of the particular Secretary at the time. Delegations of authority flow from the Secretary to the Commissioner, and not from the Under Secretary. At various times the Commissioner has reported direct to the Secretary, or through an Assistant, and, currently, through the Under Secretary. In job evaluation terms, the Commissioner's supervisor is the Secretary, with the Under Secretary as his assistant for this purpose, among others, considered as a single supervisory combination. This is at a high level, an instance of a position of Assistant Chief—here, the Under Secretary—not necessarily a grade higher than a principal subordinate of their Chief, even though the subordinate reports through the Assistant Chief.

Again in job evaluation terms, a comparison of the positions of the Commissioner and the Under Secretary confirms that they are substantially equivalent, all factors being considered, even though one is higher in hierarchical rank. The public identification and management responsibility of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the operations of the Service, involve the tremendous magni-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

tude of its internal progaming and its nationwide external relations, compensate for the higher policy coordination responsibilities and superior hierarchical authority of the Under Secretary, so that the two positions present differing but equal "factor profiles"; each is strong in different respects or factors, and equal compensation for the two positions is therefore not inappropriate.

Third. Special status of the Internal Revenue Service within the Treasury Department.

Following the reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service in 1952, the principle was established by the Treasury that supervision of the Service by the Secretary and his office should be for policy control and coordination only. Details of tax administration and operations are left to the Commissioner and the Service, in order to insure public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the tax system.

The special status of the Internal Revenue Service within the Treasury Department has been recognized in an interesting fashion in a White House document. In 1955 Foreign Operations Administration—the predecessor of AID—was changed by a reorganization order from an independent agency to a part of the Department of State—as International Cooperation Administration. President Eisenhower at that time explained that the foreign aid agency would function within the Department of State in the same manner as Internal Revenue within the Treasury Department, that is, with internal autonomy for its operations, but subject to policy coordination and control by the Department.

It should be noted in this connection that the Administrator of AID—still operating with "super-bureau" status within State, as the successor to Foreign Operations Administration and ICA—is in level II in the proposed Federal Executive Pay Act, along with the Under Secretary of State. A pay status for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of at least level III is certainly appropriate, to give similar treatment with this parallel "superbureau" organization.

EFFECT OF H.R. 8986 ON THE RELATIVE RANKING OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

H.R. 8986 was introduced by Congressman MORRISON on October 30, 1963, and approved by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on November 13, 1963. It provides, in effect, for fixing of the salary for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in a manner which seems completely inconsistent with prior statutes, and inequitable with respect to the relative scope of authority and responsibility of other positions covered by the bill.

Section 104(a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, as amended (5USC2203), placed the position of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as No. 1, in a salary range providing for a total of 20 positions, as follows:

1. Commissioner of Internal Revenue.
2. Director of Central Intelligence.
3. Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
4. Administrator of the Small Business Administration.
5. Administrator of General Services.
6. Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.
7. Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
8. Director of the International Cooperation Administration (now Agency for International Development).
9. Director of the U.S. Information Agency.
10. Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.
11. President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.
12. Under Secretary of the Treasury.
13. Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.
14. Deputy Postmaster General.
15. Under Secretary of the Interior.
16. Under Secretary of Agriculture.
17. Under Secretary of Commerce.
18. Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.
19. Under Secretary of Labor.
20. Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In H.R. 8986, nearly all of these positions now paid on the same basis as the position of Commissioner of Internal Revenue are assigned either to level II or to level III of the proposed executive pay scale, for which rates of $32,500 and $30,500, respectively, are provided. The highest possible salary which the President could assign to the position of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under H.R. 8986 would be $29,500, i.e., level IV. The only other Executive Pay Act positions now paid at the same rate as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, which are not provided for in the listings of level II or level III of H.R. 8986, are the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration (an agency with 239 employees) and the President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington (an agency with 275 employees). The Commissioner of Internal Revenue is responsible for the management of an agency with over 60,000 employees, located at more than 1,000 posts of duty throughout all of the 50 States and in a number of foreign countries. Also the Commissioner is concerned with directing the administration and enforcement of the tax laws of the United States, which directly and indirectly affect each and every citizen, the economy, including the complete range of business enterprise from the very smallest businessman to the giant corporations, and the collection of over $100 billion in taxes. He is also concerned with directing the enforcement of the laws and regulations governing the alcohol and tobacco industries.

	Size of agency
Positions listed in level II of H.R. 8986 which are not considered to have responsibilities greater than those of the Commissioner are:	
Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration	25,828
Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation	14,014
Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	188
Administrator for International Development	16,304
Director of the U.S. Information Agency	*11,450
Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (not available*).	
Positions listed in level III of H.R. 8986 which are not considered to have responsibilities greater than those of the Commissioner are:	
Administrator of Federal Aviation Agency	45,863
Administrator of General Services Administration	32,001
Administrator of Small Business Administration	3,180
Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission	6,953
Deputy Administrator of National Aeronautics and Space Agency	25,828
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs	°173,411
Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency	°13,626
Director of Central Inteligence (not available°).	
Chairman of Civil Aeronautics Board	*831
Chairman of Federal Communications Commission	*1,435
Chairman of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	*1,236
Chairman of Federal Home Loan Bank Board	*1,194
Chairman of Federal Maritime Commission	*196
Chairman of Federal Power Commission	*1,034
Chairman of Interstate Commerce Commission	*2,410
Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission	*4,146
Chairman of Securities Exchange Commission	*1,405
Chairman of National Labor Relations Board	*2,056
Chairman of Tennessee Valley Authority	*18,025
Director of Office of Emergency Planning	*454
Director of Medicine and Surgery of VA	*831

NOTE.—Of the positions listed above, which would go to salaries higher than the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under H.R. 8986, many now actually receive a lesser salary than the Commissioner, under the present Executive Pay Act. Positions now paid at lower rates, which would go to level III (above the Commissioner), and, in one case, to level II, are those marked with an asterisk(*) i.e., a majority of those listed. (Positions marked "°" have same salary as Commissioner at present.)

The proposed salary alinement, with a substantial demotion in relative ranking for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, looks like an underestimation of the importance of the tax agency and the Commissioner's position. There may also be a possible misunderstanding of the special status of the Internal Revenue Service within the Treasury Department, so that it is not "just another bureau," as its equality in salary with the Under Secretary, for the past 7 years, partially demonstrates. The Commissioner's salary should be continued on a par with others of equal importance, as measured by the Congress, not less than level III. On no account should this position be relegated to a level below so many other executive positions now paid at lesser rates, and with much less substantial duties and responsibilities.

In summary, level II in H.R. 8986 now has nine positions, whose current salaries range from $22,500 to $20,500, as compared to $21,000 for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. (These nine include one now paid at the same rate as the Commissioner, and one now paid at a lower rate.) Level III has 42 positions, whose current salaries range from $25,000 to $20,000, including 9 higher, 16 at the Commissioner's present rate ($21,000), and 17 hitherto at lower rates ($20,500 and $20,000) than the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

AMENDMENT BY MR. OLSEN OF MONTANA TO TITLE III OF H.R. 8986, RELATING TO CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, INCLUDING JUDGES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, the primary purpose of this amend-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

ment is to provide appropriate adjustments in compensation for the judges of the courts of the District of Columbia. The amendment, also, will adjust the compensation of the Superintendent of Schools and the Deputy Superintendent, the Police and Fire Chiefs, and make a better alinement for the salaries of the members of the Board of Commissioners.

During the deliberations by the committee on H.R. 8986, it was called to our attention that no provision was made for adjusting the compensation of any officials of the District of Columbia. A recommendation was made in committee concerning the members of the Board of Commissioners. Subsequently, it was brought to my attention that adjustments, also, should be included for the judges of the District courts, the Superintendent of Schools, and the Police Chief and Fire Chief.

This proposal has the approval of our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, and several other members of the committee.

My amendment includes the president of the Board of Commissioners and the two Commissioners. It also includes the chief judge and 2 associate judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, the chief judge and 15 associate judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the chief judge and 2 associate judges of the District of Columbia Juvenile Court, the judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court, the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia, and the Police Chief and Fire Chief.

Cost of Amendment for District of Columbia Officials

23 judges	$197,000
2 school officers	15,000
Police and Fire Chiefs	8,000
Commissioners	8,500
Total	228,500

Mr. MORRISON. In other words, this is done with the approval and on request of the chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, Mr. McMILLAN, the gentleman from South Carolina, and is comparable to all other salary increase requests in the executive portion of the bill?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. That is correct.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Would the gentleman tell the House at what level the U.S. Board of Parole would be compensated? This Board is a regulatory quasi-judicial board which exercises the sentencing function under the indeterminate sentence law. They are Presidential appointees who determine the length of sentences of the Federal prison population.

Mr. MORRISON. They are in the Classification Act, and they will get a proportionate increase in pay to everyone in a similar position.

Mr. O'NEILL. I merely ask this question to spell it out in the RECORD.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, so far as the committee members on this side are concerned we accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Is it not correct that the Classification Act or the rank-and-file employees of the District of Columbia are covered automatically; they are included in this bill and always are included in the Classification Act as voted by our committee?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. The gentleman from Virginia is correct. All of the rank-and-file employees of the District of Columbia are within the Classification Act. We have already passed that section of the bill here today. This has to do with supervisory officers who have to be specifically taken care of by this amendment.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. As the gentleman has pointed out this has the approval of the chairman and the majority of the members of the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Yes; and by their recommendation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose this is as good a time as any to discuss the recommittal motion that I shall offer. We have in this amendment a perfect example of how, dealing with one section at a time or with one category of workers at a time, we are apt to get it altogether out of kilter. Consequently, when it comes down to the recommittal motion that I shall make, it will apply to titles II, III, and IV where salary increases go as high as approximately $10,000.

My amendment will put a ceiling on these raises of $7,500. In every case the salary of people will be adjusted up or down from the figure of $30,000. Members of Congress and District Judges would, under that amendment if it pass, be at $30,000. All the other positions which are presently below the pay of Members of Congress will be that much reduced. Jobs which carry higher salaries such as circuit judges, Supreme Court Judges, will be higher. That motion will have to affect this amendment as well so that these increases will be scaled down.

We have, for example, to start with, the President of the Board of Commissioners and two Commissioners. The president's salary is raised to $29,500. The two Commissioners' salaries are raised to $29,000. So I hope that by cutting back these titles, II, III, and IV, and doing it in a lump operation, we can put everything in progression and keep everything in balance and thus eliminate any inequities.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. In other words, under the motion to recommit to which the gentleman has referred, the increases are set at $7,500 instead of $10,000 in a certain category. A person voting for the motion to recommit is voting to increase the salary of a Member of Congress by $7,500. If he votes against the motion to recommit, that is in effect a vote for an increase of $10,000. I should like to inform the gentleman that I shall vote against the motion to recommit because I intend to vote against the entire bill.

Mr. CORBETT. That is the gentleman's prerogative. A person may vote for or against a motion to recommit or for or against final passage. That is his prerogative which he has always had. I feel that on the basis of such information as I can secure that is what the other body is apt to do. I do not see why we need to do something contrary here.

Mr. Chairman, I understand fully that we do not need to be governed by that, but these are a part of the possible facts of life.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CORBETT. Yes.

Mr. KYL. There is also the possibility that regardless of what action is taken on this motion to recommit, the other body can take whatever action it desires. If it accepts the action of the House, we will need no conference and the bill is approved without any further action on the part of the House.

Mr. CORBETT. I might say to the gentleman that we did make numerous requests to persons who might be handling this bill in the other body. We requested meetings with them, but they have not been held.

Therefore, the gentleman can be sure, as he points out, that the other body is certainly going to act independently of what we might do. But, in any event, I did want to explain this and I did not want to catch anyone by surprise with the motion to recommit. I am certainly going to offer it in the sincere hope that it does prevail.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am against a pay raise for Congressmen at either $32,500 or $30,000. So that no one will construe that I am in fact for a raise at either level. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa and to inform my colleagues I shall vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] who offered this amendment, do I understand that some of these pay raises—well, let me just take the Commissioners of the District of Columbia—what are they presently paid and to what figure would they be increased?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. If the gentleman will yield, the present salary of the President and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia is $19,000. The bill would raise the President to $29,500 and

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

would raise the two members of the Commission to $29,000.

Mr. GROSS. To $29,000?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. From a present salary of $19,000?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. That is what I said.

Mr. GROSS. That is a pretty good pay increase for a member of a city council. We do not do that well in Waterloo, Iowa. Perhaps we are old-fashioned.

I want the Members of this House to understand this: that as far as I know—and I attended most of the sessions of the committee in the hearings on this bill—there was no testimony taken in justification for the amendment that the gentleman from Montana has just offered. There was not one word of testimony before the committee in justification for these pay increases. If I am wrong, please correct me.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Might I suggest to the gentleman that the reason they do not have this kind of a pay scale in Waterloo, Iowa, is because they may have more responsible members of the city council there than they have in this House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and it is my understanding that there has been no hearing before that committee.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is right. I have been a member of that committee and I do not remember ever hearing that matter discussed in the committee in any manner, nor have I heard it discussed elsewhere.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I am not familiar with the efficiency of the commissioners or other people in the home city or State of the gentleman from Iowa, but I am familiar with the workings of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. I am also familiar with the workings of many officials in the Northeast and throughout the metropolitan areas. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that they work effectively. They are hardly all bad and in many instances they are terribly underpaid.

Mr. GROSS. That is the opinion of the gentleman from Connecticut. I refuse to yield further. The gentleman can obtain time.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I came prepared and I have been waiting for 2 days to use these figures. The head of the University Hospital in Iowa makes $30,000. The president of your State university makes $26,000—your two universities—and the Director of Mental Health in Iowa is paid $25,000.

Mr. GROSS. I thought we were talking about the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the nominal city council of the District of Columbia.

While the gentleman from Arizona is on his feet does he have a run-down on the salaries paid the State and municipal officials in the State of Arizona?

I understand that they are not too high.

Mr. UDALL. The Governor of Arizona makes the same salary you and I do, the superintendent of schools of my hometown makes $6,000 more.

Mr. GROSS. Go on through the list of your State officials. I imagine they are comparable to what they are in the State of Iowa.

Mr. UDALL. Yes. You get what you pay for.

Mr. GROSS. For the information of those who are so gleeful and have such a proclivity for spending the taxpayers' money, may I say that in the State of Iowa we have no bonded debt. Our Constitution prohibits bonded debt in the name of the State of Iowa except for $200,000 or $300,000.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman, who is a pretty good spender in his own right of the taxpayers' money, think he can make a contribution at this time?

Mr. HAYS. I just wanted to tell the gentleman we had no bonded debt in Ohio until a Republican Governor came into office a few years ago.

Mr. O'NEILL. Show me a State that is not in debt, and I will show you a State that does not take care of its mentally retarded or its aged.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. OLSEN of Montana), there were—ayes 115, noes 138.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CUNNINGHAM: On page 41, strike out line 11 and all that follows down through the period in line 22 on page 72.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I tried to eliminate title II because I am opposed to raising my salary and because I felt that titles II, III, and IV did not properly belong in a bill from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and that the subject matter of titles II, III, and IV had not been so considered by that committee in prior years. I know for a fact that the legislative, executive, and judicial salary schedules in the bill were not developed within the committee but from an outside source. Again, I will say I do not pretend to tell any Member of this body what to do, but I think the legislative, executive, and judicial salaries should be divorced from title I, which the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has traditionally handled. I do not believe any of us on the committee know where these figures that are in the bill were developed as far as title III is concerned. Just now we had an amendment to drastically rewrite the salary figures in title III. I doubt whether very many members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service certainly on my side of the aisle know where these figures came from. So my amendment is to strike title III for the reasons stated.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have already plowed this ground on title II and determined to leave title II in the bill. Very shortly we shall have an opportunity to pass on this bill and vote it up or down. But we ought to have a logical bill with correlated pay schedules for the executive, judicial, and legislative branches. If you pass this bill without any of these titles you will have a bobtailed bill which would have something for the classified employees and the legislative branch but nothing for the Federal executives and the judiciary.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment for another reason. I ask you to turn to page 46 of the bill. There you will find the provisions which I previously designated as the Presidential reward and punishment section. In other words, the President can move salaries up and down between $26,500 and $29,500. He can play them up and down the string as he sees fit, as he deems appropriate. On page 46, beginning in line 6 and running down through line 2 on page 47, this language ought to be stricken. This title of the bill ought to be stricken with that language in it.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I direct attention particularly to line 9 on page 46, by virtue of which members of regulatory boards and commissions are included in this discretionary authority given the President.

Mr. GROSS. To raise and lower salaries at his pleasure.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of statements made earlier by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN], I should like to ask a question of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] or the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]. As I understand it, the salaries of the Chairmen of such independent boards and agencies as the National Labor Relations Board and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve are fixed by the terms of this bill. However, the salaries of the other members of such independent boards and agencies are not fixed by this bill; instead the bill would delegate authority to the President "from time to time" to fix their salaries within certain limits. The language on page 46, beginning on line 6, indicates certain guidelines which refer to regulatory boards and commissions; however, it is not clear that this language limits the discretion

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

otherwise given to the President. Accordingly, I should like to ask whether it is true, as stated previously, that the President could change the salaries from time to time of members of such independent boards as the NLRB? I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona because I think we should have the answer to that inquiry.

Mr. UDALL. I appreciate the gentleman's concern, and there has been some very serious concern on the part of many Members about this feature of the bill. This was touched on yesterday by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER].

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am sorry that I did not have the opportunity to hear the gentleman's speech on yesterday.

Mr. UDALL. It is in the RECORD and he made a very good explanation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. May I ask, what did he say?

Mr. UDALL. To answer your question specifically, the President would have some discretion; he could put members of the commissions that you refer to as I read the bill in level 4, 5, or 6. He has made it very clear or the Civil Service Commission and the Budget Bureau who conducted these studies and through this bill make it very clear that the major regulatory agency members are to go in level 4. There is no argument about it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. But if the President—and I do not refer to any particular President because my concern would be the same regardless of who the President might be or to which party he belonged—If the President should not like the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board, and if he were of a mind to do so, then he could reduce the salaries of members of the NLRB; is that a correct interpretation under this bill?

Mr. UDALL. Theoretically he could do so, but if any President ever does, I will join with the gentleman to take some action.

Mr. GRIFFIN. But I do not know why in the world we would want to give a President that discretion in view of the fact that such agencies and commissions are supposed to be independent quasi-judicial bodies?

Mr. UDALL. This is a discretion between $26,500 and $29,000. It is a very limited discretion. Because the trouble has been, just like you have 20 committees of the House and Senate and each one has their favorite agency or agencies, and there are 50 pages of salary legislation fixing the salaries of the various regulatory commissions, and there has been no coordination. This is finally the first time in the history of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget working through our committee that we have tried to draw up a structure to add some flexibility and make sense as between all these different agencies.

Mr. GRIFFIN. It would seem to me that we could say very simply that members of such agencies as the NLRB, the ICC, and other regulatory boards and commissions with quasi-judicial functions should be paid $500 or $1,000 a year less than the chairman of the board or commission, whose salary is fixed by this bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Just as a matter of information, this flexibility was written into the law because it does conform to what is the law at the present time. The Civil Service Commission has the right to change the titles and the compensation and job descriptions for over 1 million employees.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Does the Commission have the authority now to set the salaries of members of the NLRB if they do not decide cases the way they want them to?

Mr. CORBETT. Well, when you are saying that he is going to change their salary if they do not make decisions the way they want them to, that is another question. However, on these independent regulatory agencies, I do not believe that fixing their salaries firmly and taking that flexibility away from the Executive would be a good thing.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I wonder if, as a matter of law, the Civil Service Commission can now set the salaries of members of regulatory agencies with quasi-judicial authority.

Mr. CORBETT. I do not believe they have that authority.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I believe that such salaries are fixed by law, and if they are not, they should be.

Mr. CORBETT. I think we can agree with the gentleman, if he can find some way to write an amendment which would still preserve the flexibility of the Executive. Or else leave these things under its present authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete agreement with the amendments being offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], a member of the committee which has had this bill under consideration. The Cunningham amendments will strike titles II, III, and IV from the bill. Title II includes salary increases for Members of Congress and legislative employees. Title III includes salary increases for members of the Cabinet and other top salaried positions in the executive branch of Government. Title IV includes salary increases for members of the Supreme Court and other Federal judges.

I oppose any increase in salaries for the offices covered by these three titles, and particularly increases for Members of Congress. I believe that salaries for some positions in the Federal service are too low but they certainly are not those covered by titles II, III, and IV of this bill.

I feel it is a real privilege and an honor to represent the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio. These fine people first elected me to Congress in 1958 and at that time, I knew what the salary would be during my tenure of service, I entered into the service completely satisfied with that salary and I'm still satisfied with it. As one Member of Congress, I want no change in my salary and intend to vote against this bill if the Cunningham amendments are not adopted deleting these proposed increases. A $10,000-a-year increase in salary is ridiculous at any time and certainly at a time when we are attempting to reduce taxes and balance the budget. According to the 1960 census, 66,462 of the 75,026 families in my district had incomes less than $10,000 per year. To be a party to any effort to increase my salary by more than the incomes of these 66,462 families would be unconscionable.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STINSON) there were—ayes 50, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "Federal Judicial Salary Act of 1963".

SEC. 402. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, section 604(a)(5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this Act with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949 as amended.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(d) Section 40a of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 68(a)), relating to the compensation of full-time and part-time referees in bankruptcy, is amended by striking out the existing compensation limitations contained therein and inserting new limitations of "$24,000" and "$12,000", respectively.

SEC. 403. (a) Section 5 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, is amended by striking out "$35,500" and substituting therefor "$45,500", and by striking out "$35,000" and substituting therefor "$45,000".

(b) Section 44(d) of title 28, United States Code, relating to circuit judges, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$35,500".

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

(c) Section 135 of title 28, United States Code, relating to district judges, is amended by striking out "$22,500" and substituting therefor "$32,500", and by striking out "$23,000" and substituting therefor "$33,000".

(d) Section 173 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Claims, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$35,500".

(e) Section 213 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$35,500".

(f) Section 252 of title 28, United States Code, relating to judges of the Customs Court, is amended by striking out "$22,500" and substituting therefor "$32,500".

(g) The first paragraph of section 603 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of the Director and the Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, is amended to read as follows:

"The Director shall receive a salary of $29,500 a year. The Deputy Director shall receive a salary of $28,000 a year."

(h) Subsection (b) of section 792 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the compensation of commissioners of the Court of Claims, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each commissioner shall receive basic compensation at the rate of $28,000 a year, and also all necessary traveling expenses and a per diem allowance as provided in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business and away from Washington, District of Columbia."

(i) Section 7443(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (68A Stat. 879), as amended, relating to judges of the Tax Court of the United States, is further amended by striking out "$22,500" and substituting therefor "$32,500".

(j) Section 867 of title 10, United States Code, relating to judges of the Court of Military Appeals, is amended by striking out "$25,500" and substituting therefor "$35,500".

Mr. MORRISON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. The remainder of the bill?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes, the remainder of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object. I will not object if the gentleman will limit the request to the title.

Mr. MORRISON. There are only two more titles, title IV and title V.

Mr. GROSS. We have been dealing with each title.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, then, that title IV be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would that preclude the offering of an amendment to title III?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that title III has been passed and title IV is being considered at the present time. The request applies to title IV.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OLSEN OF MONTANA

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLSEN of Montana: On page 72, line 25, strike out "1963" and insert in lieu thereof "1964".

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a clarifying amendment, so that the title will be properly titled for 1964.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CUNNINGHAM: On page 72, strike out line 23 and all that follows down through the period in line 6 on page 76,

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this amendment would strike out title IV.

At the beginning, when I started to talk about this subject, I said that postal and classified people, in my view should be divorced from the legislative, executive, and judicial, because the last three categories have never come before our committee and have never been given serious consideration. I do not yet know where those salary figures came from.

I believe that title IV ought to go to the Judiciary Committee, which knows the problems and needs of the judiciary.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

We have tentatively agreed to title II, to cover the legislative. We have tentatively agreed to title III, to cover the executive. Now we are on title IV, and the gentleman's amendment would strike it out.

If we are going to have to increase it, I hope the salaries will be related to each other and to all three branches of the Government.

I ask the amendment be defeated.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I would like to ask the gentleman if the folks on your side would not agree by unanimous consent to allow for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] to go back to title III to offer an amendment dealing with the regulatory bodies. It would only take a couple of minutes.

Mr. UDALL. I would have no objection on my part.

Mr. CORBETT. As soon as this amendment is disposed of we will seek a unanimous consent agreement on that.

Mr. UDALL. All right.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have come down to title IV, which deals with the salaries of Federal judges, including the Justices of the Supreme Court. I can think of no Federal employees that need a salary increase less than the Justices of the Supreme Court and the Federal judges of this country. As Members well know, they hold lifetime appointments and they contribute not one dime to their retirements, which are the most liberal that could be devised. Here it is proposed to raise the salaries of the Justices of the Supreme Court to $45,000 and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to $45,500. How much further in orbit do you want to put this bill? How much more do you want to load on the backs of the taxpayers of this country? This provision of the bill should be defeated.

I do not want to prolong debate on this measure even though there is no $100-per-plate fundraising dinner being staged in Washington tonight for my benefit. I understand there is one and it is labeled as a political fund-raising dinner, but it is hoped that it will also be in the nature of a pay increase victory dinner. I hope not, because this entire bill ought to be defeated. However, I can think of no title in this bill that is less worthy of being approved by the Congress of the United States at this time than this particular title in view of the lifetime jobs and the free retirements that the judges and the justices get.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I indicated I would offer an amendment striking title IV, relating to the Judiciary. The gentleman from Nebraska has now offered a similar amendment. The gentleman from Nebraska and I are in agreement that this section is a matter that should be properly considered by the Committee on the Judiciary and should be divorced from this bill.

Again I say, in view of several recent decisions by members of the Supreme Court, many of my constituents feel that it might be proper that they be paying $35,000 a year for the privilege of sitting on that Court rather than have their salaries raised to $45,000 per year.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to defend our judicial system and the Supreme Court. Throughout the history of the Nation, our courts have stood as bulwarks of individual rights and liberties. It may truly be said that among the heroes of this century are those Judges and Justices of the Supreme Court who have advanced the cause of freedom. We should honor and revere men such as Judge Learned Hand, Justices Holmes and Brandeis and Chief Justice Warren. It is they who are the spiirtual inheritors of the great ideals of the Founding Fathers. Their decisions have produced some of the shining moments in our history. We shall be forever grateful to them for protecting and preserving the rights guaranteed us in the Bill of Rights and the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

It ill-becomes the Members of this House to mount scurrilous attacks on the courts. It has always been a source of pride for Americans that ours is a society founded on the rule of law and respect for the courts. Some of the very Members who have criticized the courts today are the very ones who have denounced certain groups in this country for their lack of respect for law and order. Their actions here today do not contribute to the goal they profess to seek.

In these times it would be a grievous error for this House to demean the prestige of the Federal judiciary by eliminating the proposed pay increases for Federal judges from this bill. We will strengthen the cause of democracy and promote the cause of justice and orderly government by showing the Judges and Justices of the Supreme Court the dignity and admiration due them. Let us support the bill as reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STINSON) there were—ayes 97, noes 130.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 76, after line 6, add a new title to read as follows:

"TITLE V—WORKING PRESS

"SEC. 501. Recognizing that the working press is grossly underpaid, on and after the effective date of this Act, any accredited member of the House or Senate Press, Radio, or Periodical Gallery, whose salary has not been increased by his or her employer by at least 44 per centum over what they were receiving before passage of this Act, shall be denied the privileges of the Press Gallery, and the privileges of the Press Gallery shall be denied to the employees of any employer who has failed to comply with the provisions of this section."

Mr. UDALL. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. UDALL. I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we have now done something for all the employees of the Government. The working press is a quasi-public body. In fact, members of the press are more faithful in their attendance on the House even than Members of this body. I think they should have consideration in this bill

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman's amendment is clearly not germane to the bill. It applies to a group of people who do not come within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when this amendment was first proposed—and I do not claim altogether the authorship of it—somebody suggested it might be unconstitutional. I said, Well, I do not think it is unconstitutional if we look at it on a comparative basis with what we did in the civil rights bill last week. There we said who a man could hire or fire. And we said in other laws how much they shall be paid. I think that is the proper place to try to increase the pay of the press.

Mr. Chairman, as far as its germaneness is concerned, I might not argue so much about that. However, I feel that if we are going to take care of the people who are employed in the House and in the Federal Government and over in the Supreme Court and everywhere else and give them a raise, I believe these people in the Press Gallery ought to have a raise.

Mr. Chairman, I had planned to offer an amendment to this amendment and I believe the members of the committee would have welcomed the opportunity of voting for that amendment. Someone said:

I would be in favor of having an increase in salary for the Press Gallery if they would not ride our elevators to the third floor when we have a quorum call and go up to the third floor.

So I was hoping that I could make some kind of an arrangement along that line.

Also, Mr. Chairman, there was another suggestion to this effect: How about all these people who come here and go through the torture of listening to me and other Members who talk here. Perhaps we could do something for them. I was preparing to do that when I was cut off.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does the gentleman want to get in on this too?

Mr. HAYS. Yes. The gentleman can do something for the people in the galleries by just sitting down. That will relieve them.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I shall now resume my seat.

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. It was my understanding that there was a gentlemen's agreement that we were to return to title III and permit the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] to offer an amendment.

I ask that before title V is taken up it be in order that the gentleman from Michigan be permitted to offer his amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I had indicated informally that as soon as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] could complete compiling his amendment, then on whatever title we were proceeding, I for one would suggest that we give him unanimous consent to return to title III. I had understood he was not yet prepared to offer his amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If this is the appropriate time, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MORRISON. I object. We have already passed that title. If we continue to go back to titles which we have passed, we will have to go back to the beginning of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not aware of any previous agreement.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FINDLEY. Am I correct in assuming that an amendment would be in order to add a new title after line 6 on page 76?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be at this time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 76, after line 6, insert a new title to read as follows:

"TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE OF SALARY INCREASES

"SEC. 501. The authorization for appropriation for salary increases contained in this Act shall not be effective until such time as the receipts of the Government for the preceding fiscal year have exceeded the expenditures of the Government for such year, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would delay the effective date of the pay increases until the Federal Government has finished a fiscal year with a balanced budget.

It is the most practical and the surest way to a balanced budget.

It will make budget cutters out of all Members of Congress, all Cabinet officers, almost all top officials in the executive department and all other civilian employees of the Federal Establishment.

Every one of the 2,400,000 Federal employees would have a powerful personal incentive to cut official spending, eliminate waste, balance the budget. Each nickel saved would bring a pay raise that much closer.

If my amendment is adopted, I freely predict that we will have a balanced budget next year. The pressure for budget cutting will be irresistable. Imagine the cumulative effect of 2,400,000 people trying to balance the budget. And those, like Members of Congress and Cabinet officers who have the greatest control over spending policies, would have the biggest personal incentive of all—$10,000 a year to be exact.

Let us not kid ourselves. Human nature being what it is, this amendment would make this pay bill a sure-fire way to a balanced budget.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Ways would be found to make big cuts in spending, and quick. It would not surprise me if the feverish budget-cutting activity which this amendment would set in motion might even wash away the $10 million deficit predicted for this year—notwithstanding the fact that the fiscal year is two-thirds gone.

The budget-cutting incentive of a $10,000-a-year pay raise could do wonders.

It is a simple question of priority. Which should come first, a pay raise or a balanced budget?

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I think everything we are doing here ought to lead in the direction of stability. There is no point in having a pay raise if inflation comes along and wipes the whole thing out like a spring flood. This is a very practical amendment, and I shall support it.

Certainly I would gladly vote for this bill if it were not for the capacity that we have shown to authorize and spend more each year than we are taking in.

It has been but a few days since the greatest tax reduction bill in the history of the Republic was signed into law.

This loss of revenue is supposed to be compensated for by an increase in all commerce—yet we have yet to experience that.

We have seen State governments increase their tax-take from the common purse of the Nation, we have heard our labor leaders say they will ask for wage raises.

Nothing is certain except that we can expect to continue to be tossed upon the stormy waters of instability.

Yet should the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] to make the enactment of this legislation contingent on a balanced budget—then I can vote for this measure with some assurance.

(Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the balanced budget amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]. I had planned to offer this amendment myself. This is just plain, sound economics.

The amendment:

> The authorization for an appropriation contained in this act shall not be effective until such time as the receipts of the Government for the preceding fiscal year have exceeded the expenditures of the Government for such year, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

It simply states that we will not spend more money until, through economizing, we save it, or through increased revenues, we raise it. With this amendment, those who make most of our final decisions on Federal spending—Representatives, Senators, Cabinet officers—would have a powerful, personal incentive, $10,000-a-year to be exact, to eliminate waste and cut back on Government spending. To lesser degrees, so would all other Federal employees. Each citizen would help to balance the Federal budget, and a balanced budget would be the key to higher pay.

I would very much like to see my civil service friends, particularly the hard-working, dedicated postal employees, receive a pay increase. Our Cabinet officers and Members of Congress are, for the most part, outstanding, capable executives and deserve salaries commensurate with their responsibilities. However, at a time when our Federal budget is at an all-time high, when our deficit is so great, and our national debt is greater than that of all nations combined, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for his all-encompassing pay raise without a balanced national budget.

If we are for economy in Government, if we do really want a meaningful tax cut, then we should, and must, curb spending. Voting ourselves a 40-percent salary increase is not frugal or wise at this time. I have constantly endeavored to vote for responsible fiscal policy.

Gentlemen, let us stop waste in our Government, let us stop giving our hard-earned tax dollars away in expensive and uncontrollable foreign aid programs. Let us get this business of Government operating on a sound fiscal basis and balance our budget, then we can justify a salary increase.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The best thing that could possibly happen for every American citizen and to the generations yet unborn would be a balanced budget, hence I strongly support the Findley amendment which provides that when the budget is balanced the provisions of this bill shall become effective, but not before. If the Findley amendment is approved and this bill to raise Federal employees' and Congressmen's wages is made law, I am sure every Federal agency head and every Congressman would be strong for Government economy in order to get the pay raises provided in this bill at the earliest date possible.

Mr. Chairman, a balanced U.S. budget is a must in order to halt the declining purchasing value of everybody's dollar. It would soon more than offset the benefits in this bill for Federal employees and Congressmen, and then we could safely pass a big tax reduction bill, one that would give great impetus to our entire economy. It would impose no great hardship on anyone to wait for this proposed pay raise until the budget is balanced, and the people's heavy tax load is lightened.

I hope the Findley amendment will be adopted. Without its adoption I cannot support this bill.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8986 in its present form.

I have advised every postal employee and postmaster who urged me to support this bill that I would like to support the bill for comparability of postal pay. That I have always supported their reasonable requests.

But I cannot in good conscience vote for the unreasonable salary increases provided for the executive, judicial, and congressional branches of Government.

If the postal pay bill remains a part of this omnibus bill, I will accordingly vote against this bill.

The nominal and modest changes in this bill by amendment have not changed the position I have already announced.

Because of the persistent and continuing rumors on the floor that this bill will be railroaded through without a record vote I voted against the rule to express my opposition and resentment. I will stand at the demand for a record vote to assure every Member the recording of his vote.

At a time when we are urging economy and a reduction of expenditures in the operation of our Government we should not be even considering raises of the magnitude contained in this bill.

A tax cut has just been voted—to make that worthwhile or meaningful we must restrain Government spending and hold down costs.

When we stop borrowing and start reducing the national debt, when we put our economic house in order, we may have justified the discussion of a pay raise for the bureaucracy and Members of Congress.

A motion to recommit which makes provision for congressional pay raises does not remove any objection to this bill and I will therefore oppose it as well as opposing the bill.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Illinois that the spirit which prompts the offering of this amendment is laudible, but I personally question the practicality of it. Suppose 25 percent of the Government employees and 25 percent of the Members of Congress actually and sincerely attempted to cut expenditures. Is it the gentlemen's intent to penalize the other 75 percent forevermore and, if we do not cut the budget, foreclose them from any increase in salary?

Mr. FINDLEY. That is not anticipated or suggested. The objective of the amendment is to bring about a balanced budget. Even if 10 percent of the people on the Federal payroll accomplished that and 90 percent stood idly by, it would accomplish a balanced budget.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Laudable as the idea may be, I wish to point out very clearly that you are placing an absolutely impossible responsibility on more than a million and a half employees who have nothing to say about the expenditures of Government, but who would be penalized.

There are two ways to balance the budget. You can either reduce expenditures, or you can increase revenues. No matter how low you may decrease expenditures, you still cannot increase revenue, and you may never have a balanced budget. It seems to me this is placing a restriction on a salary increase that is beyond the realm of constructive criticism.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MORRISON. We have already been over this ground. The gentleman is exactly correct. We have already met this issue. I think we ought to go ahead and get along with the bill.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be voted down.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is significant to point out that the gentleman has offered this amendment from time to time, but that he picks his spots. I took particular notice, because I like to know what is going on around here, that the gentleman did not offer this amendment to the public works bill. I also took particular notice that the gentleman had some projects in the public works bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. Do you want to deny it?

Mr. FINDLEY. Well——

Mr. HAYS. I do not yield to you for a speech. If you want to deny that what I have said is true, I will yield to you. Otherwise, let us vote.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say to the gentleman who offered the amendment that he is incorrect if he thinks that those of us who vote for spending measures that we think vital to the security and well-being of our Nation will turn out backs on the needs of the Nation, in order to get ourselves a pay increase. The gentleman talks about human nature. That does not happen to be my human nature.

(Mr. CLANCY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8986 because I do not believe the proposed salary increase for Members of Congress is justified.

At a time when we are urging economy and reduction of expenditures in the operation of our Government, we should not be considering raises for ourselves. In my opinion, this bill is exceedingly ill timed, coming as it does on the heels of the recent tax cut. I cannot conscientiously vote for a bill which would provide for salary increases for ourselves of more than $5 million annually. Any pay increase will have to come from borrowed revenue and will, as a result, contribute to a further growth of the national debt which has now reached an alltime high of approximately $312 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I also intend to vote against the motion to recommit if it provides for any increase in congressional salaries. It is my understanding that a motion to recommit will be offered which will increase the salary of Members of Congress by $7,500 instead of the $10,000 provided in the bill reported by the committee. I intend to vote against the increase under the motion to recommit and also against the bill itself which provides for the full $10,000 increase.

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. I have supported efforts to delete the pay raises of the Congressmen, Supreme Court members and top executives in Washington. All of these efforts failed. It seems incredible to me that we should pass a $11.5 billion tax cut, consciously head this country in the direction of deficit spending and then sanctimoniously vote ourselves a $10,000 pay increase.

Admittedly, the congressional pay increase is only a small portion of this bill, roughly $5 million out of a total of $545 million. It is the principle that counts, in my judgment, and arguments which told us that this portion is only "peanuts" overlook the fact that we should set an example.

In my 4 years in the Ohio Legislature and my 3 years in Congress, I have been consistently conservative on fiscal policies. No one has fought increased spending any harder than I and the rollcall record shows it. However, when it comes to the pay of State or Federal workers, I have always looked at the problem from the family budget standpoint and I know that most of them have trouble making ends meet. It was with reluctance that I opposed this bill and if we had succeeded in cutting out the congressional pay and the other executive salary increases, I would have supported the increase for the rank and file workers. The Congress is committed to the principle of comparability and I am personally committed to it as a matter of belief. I will continue my efforts to cut unnecessary spending—even cut unnecessary Federal employment wherever possible—but I will also support adequate pay increases for Federal employees.

I have always felt that we cannot blame employees for the derelictions of the Congress. If there are 200,000 too many employees overall, that is not the fault of the employees. They should not be made to suffer. In this case, however, the principle is so important that it is necessary to oppose this measure. If a reasonable pay increase bill for rank and file employees comes back without these objectionable features, I will support it. Congress should get its own house in order before any increase in salary is considered. Too many people already believe that the crows are guarding our corn. Unfortunately, there is a large amount of truth in this charge.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINDLEY) there were—ayes 58, noes 164.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OLIVER P. BOLTON

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON: Page 76, strike out all after line 6 and substitute a new title V as follows:

"TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 501. This Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the day this measure becomes law, except that no increase in salary provided for in section 204 for Members of the House of Representatives shall become effective until January 1, 1965."

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is very clear. I have consistently taken the position while I have been a Member of this House that the Members of this House should be paid a salary commensurate at the very least with the cost of maintaining the job and doing a job as each Member requires.

At the same time it is my understanding that under the law of the State of Ohio, there is a constitutional provision which prohibits any member of the legislature from raising his own salary or any elected official having a salary raised during his own term of office.

I had hoped to support this bill because I feel there are numerous injustices today within our pay scales. I know of numerous cases both within the classified and the postal workers as well as in the executive department where salaries need to be raised. However, I cannot myself be in a position of voting for a salary increase for myself during the term of office that I offered myself for election at a previously understood contract price. Therefore, I have offered this amendment, hoping the House will accept the fact that we are not trying to establish salaries for this year of the Congress and we are not trying to establish salaries for us in view of the fact that we agreed to accept the responsibilities of our office at the salary which was then the going rate, but that we believe the salary needs to be increased in order to meet the needs of Government.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. How would the gentleman apply this to the Senate?

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Under the terms of the gentleman's amendment, many of the Senators will still be in office for 2 more years and for 4 more years as the case might be. Would you have them wait until they have finished their terms of office before the salary increase applied?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. That is not a part of my amendment and I am fully aware that this is an intensely sticky wicket.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. How would you deal with the Senate under your amendment?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I frankly feel that the Senators must raise their salaries as of the 1st of January and therefore because of their staggered terms, some of them are going to have to raise their own salaries. But I do not think that applies to us in the House.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. In other words, you feel that what would apply to us should not necessarily apply to the Senate?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Because of the staggered terms.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me so that I may make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I direct this inquiry to the Chair as to whether it will be in order if I secure recognition to offer an amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the gentleman, if he is recognized, may offer an amendment.

Mr. MORRISON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman secured recognition first and asked the parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not been recognized, except for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORRISON. The gentleman has a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman made the parliamentary inquiry as to whether he could offer an amendment, and the Chair responded that the gentleman could offer an amendment if he was recognized.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the points made by the gentleman from Ohio. I feel that there should be a delay in the effect so far as Members are concerned.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON: On page 76, strike out lines 8 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 501. This Act shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after April 1, 1964, or on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act, whichever day later occurs."

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this is the last of the amendments to be offered by the committee members on the majority side.

The bill which was reported last November made all of the salary changes effective in January 1964. That time has come and gone. It is administratively difficult to provide for retroactive pay.

My amendment would provide that all the salary changes in the bill—for Members of Congress, classified, postal and all others—become effective the first pay period following April 1, or the effective date of the act, whichever comes later.

The other body, I am told, is engaged in an oratorical contest, and there is no telling when they will finish and consider this bill, if it should be passed.

This language is written so that whenever they get to this legislation the salary changes will become effective in the first pay period immediately thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, because we are nearing the end of the debate on the bill and because I wish to discuss briefly the motion to recommit, and it is important, and has not been discussed, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes beyond the 5 minutes already granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, though I do not know whether there will be any time limitation, I certainly wish to be in a position to answer the gentleman if he makes very many mistakes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. In referring to the other body and its present preoccupation, was it the gentleman's thought that perhaps, by virtue of our passing the bill and putting a time limitation into it as to when it would become effective—after they pass it—probably there might be some inducement to end the present filibuster?

Mr. UDALL. Yes. We would give them some incentive.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Before the gentleman proceeds to a discussion of the motion to recommit, in order that the Members of the House may understand fully his amendment, I should like to ask the gentleman one or two questions.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON] offered an amendment which would have the effect of limiting the effective date for Members of this body—only for Members of the House of Representatives; is that correct?

Mr. UDALL. That is correct.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Arizona has offered a substitute for the gentleman's amendment which would make it effective uniformly for all groups covered by the proposed legislation—after the signing of the proposed legislation; is that correct?

Mr. UDALL. That is correct.

Mr. BOGGS. That date would depend upon when the legislation ultimately is passed.

Mr. UDALL. Precisely.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] indicated earlier that in a few minutes, when we reach the end of debate on this bill, he will offer a motion to recommit with instructions.

The effect of the adoption of the motion would be to cut the congressional salaries from $32,500 to $30,000; to cut the salaries for Cabinet members from $35,000 to $32,500; and to make comparable cuts in the salaries of judges and lesser executive officials provided for in the bill.

I intend to oppose and to vote against the motion to recommit, and I hope it will not carry. I take these 5 or 6 minutes to discuss the reasons why.

If the bill is beaten, if the legislation does not become law, at least it is obvious to this Member that there will not be any salary legislation for any of the Federal employees this year. For too long this artificial ceiling of $22,500 has been a lid on all salary levels in the Federal Establishment. We have had people banging up against this ceiling, and a change must be made in congressional salaries or we cannot adjust the Federal compensation structure to a decent level.

This measure now to cut down the raise to $7,500 from $10,000 is a half measure. I do not think it accomplishes anything. You can go back and look at the Randall committee. They asked 1,000 people in private industry what should Members of Congress be paid. Most of the answers from businessmen, who know you have to pay in order to get brains and talent, was $50,000. They said, No, we cannot go that high. It is unrealistic. We will go to $35,000, which is a figure that any Congress ought to agree to. It is a minimum fair compensation. Then we got into committee and some were afraid that we would get into trouble and be criticized, so we cut that down to $32,500. I think today, in a misguided attempt to defend ourselves in an expression of the kind we have had here, we are failing to recognize the importance of this body and we are going to cut it down a little bit more, to $30,000. I ask those of you who are for this bill and those of you who believe salaries should be adjusted, three questions: Do you think you will get one less snide editorial with respect to you if you vote for a $7,500 increase as against a $10,000 increase? Do you think you will get one letter less of protest or one less joke will be made by the uninformed and the demagogs that you will run into back home because it was only a $7,500 in-

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

crease instead of a $10,000 increase? No; it will not make a bit of difference, and I believe we ought to face up to it and decide whether this raise is justified or is not justified. If it is justified—and I think it is—we ought to stand by it. I hope this Congress will act that way. We are downgraded all the time. This is the most important legislative body in the world as far as I am concerned, and to see its own Members timidly and fearfully take the view that we are not as important as the school superintendent in some city or the chief of police or the city manager in some city, I think is ridiculous.

We passed a bill here last year and there were only five who voted against it—only five. We raised the military salaries $1.2 billion. There was a deficit then and a bigger one. We did not hear arguments then about it. In that bill we gave the Chief of Naval Operations a salary of $32,500, $10,000 more than the great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is paid, and $6,000 or $7,000 more than the Secretary of Defense is paid. When are we going to stop being timid and afraid and let the people of this great country know that Congress is important and pay a salary to them that recognizes that we have year-long responsibility and that we represent half a million people and have demands of all kinds and are handling the affairs of the most important and greatest country of the world? We still have big discrepancies even when we get through with this bill, because we will be behind State governments and what they pay there. We will still be far behind the city governments. If you want to vote down the whole idea of fair and decent compensation for men in the Federal Government who handle billions of dollars in the executive departments, if you want to vote down the idea of adequate compensation for key executives in the Defense Department and many other agencies, then go ahead and do it, but let us not adopt a motion to recommit, which is a half-way measure and which simply says, well, we ought to have $10,000 raises; we ought to have large raises in the executive departments, but fearfully and timidly, because we are afraid to explain the good features of this bill and the necessity for this bill, we are going to attempt to soften some of the criticism by cutting it down a little bit.

One more thing I want to say is the history of the Congress is that salaries have been raised only once about every 20 years. It has been 9 years since the last time. If we pass this bill today and if we proceed the way that we have in the past, there will not be any more salary raises for 9, 10, 11, 12, or 15 years. You are fixing the salary for this Congress, if you pass this bill, not for today but for next year and the year after that and into the 1970's. I think this ought to be taken into account.

I am amazed at the people of the press in this country. The editors who have studied this bill and the men who come out and say it is necessary and good. Here was William S. White, the great writer who covered Congress and said that the pay raise of $35,000 which we proposed was not an adequate raise. He said it ought to be $50,000. I trust that the Members will decide in their hearts and in their minds what is fair and right and not be afraid of reelection or something of that kind. In 1955 when a similar bill passed with a larger percentage of increase there was not a defeat of a single incumbent, based on the conclusions of those who studied the matter, that had anything substantial to do with the pay raise of that year.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether we are going to have a rollcall vote or not. That is up to the Members. We have procedures in the House, honored procedures. We have different kinds of votes. Each man has the right to decide for himself what kind of vote he wants on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. CORBETT asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the sincerity of the gentleman who just preceded me. He has worked very hard on this bill and very courageously. However, if we look back into the history of this legislation from the beginning, we have had a series of adjustments from the start until right now; and I would remind him that when we eventually brought the bill from the committee we reduced it considerably from the recommendations either of the Randall Commission or of some of the bills that had been introduced. When we got to the floor, we came here under pretty much of an agreement.

One of the first acts of today was to pass Chairman MURRAY's amendment to title I, which cut approximately $123 million from the bill. Now I am proposing an amendment to titles II, III, and IV which will make cuts, not halfway measures as the gentleman said, but three-fourths. My amendment will simply limit any increase in titles II, III, and IV to $7,500. I submit that the differential between a salary of $30,000, the top level in grade 18, which would be $24,500, would leave a wide-open difference of $5,500, so there would be no compression for a considerable period of time.

I suspect that some of the force behind the $32,500 idea is because congressional salaries are hard to raise and they want to keep the ceiling imposed on congressional salaries above the classified top.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am advancing the recommittal motion in all sincerity and in good faith. I feel that it is in line with just what we have been doing in committee, and what we have done here in Committee of the Whole today. We will have trimmed this amount back to a figure that is much more justifiable.

Mr. Chairman, I might say in closing that if we pass this bill with the recommittal motion in it I predict that that same bill is apt to go through the other body without amendment. If it does the job will be wrapped up.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Can the gentleman tell me what would be the total saving that he calculates under his proposed motion?

Mr. CORBETT. The total saving would be significant only in this regard. There are not very many employees in titles II, III, and IV, and in fact, the entire pay raise for Congress, as the gentleman knows, is only $5.4 million, so you cannot save a great deal. But this amendment would save $3 million. It would put the cost of this bill something under the budgeted figure of $545 million.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, the big reason for the cut is as someone mentioned earlier, symbolic. Instead of having a $10,000 raise for judges and members of the executive branch, we would have an increase of $7,500.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, recommend my motion to this body and I hope it does pass.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

If the parliamentary situation had been such that I were able to do so I would have offered an amendment which would have made the effective date for the congressional pay raises for both the House and the other body January 3 of next year. Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in the fact that some of the guardians and keepers of the conscience of the Members of this House have been telling us that it is morally mandatory that anyone who votes against the pay raise reject the pay raise himself. I am surprised that there is not an equal concern on the part of those gentlemen over the matter of giving the voters and the taxpayers of the country an opportunity to pass their judgment on those who do vote either for or against the bill, by making the effective date later.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of amazement to me that this should be the case.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, even though I find myself in the same position as that exactly occupied by the gentleman from Michigan, I also have an amendment which I would have offered which would have made title II effective with the beginning of the next Congress. However, the parliamentary situation has also excluded me from offering that amendment.

However, Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this final word. In view of the implication that has been left on the record that somehow those who vote against the increase ought to waive the increase, I suggest

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

that a proposal to get that sort of issue into the next political campaign or into any campaign comes dangerously close to violating the spirit if not the letter of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act which states in effect that whoever shall offer any benefit provided for or made possible in whole or in part by an act of Congress shall be guilty of a violation.

I suggest that anyone who wants to campaign for election or reelection on the basis that he did not take the pay and will not take the pay voted by the Congress is in serious jeopardy with respect to that law.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bolton amendment. I feel its enactment should make this bill more acceptable to Members from California.

It happens that in our State, as in Ohio and certain others, the law prohibits an increase in the salary of an elective official during the term of office to which he was elected. This constitutional provision in California applies to the pay of statewide officials, county supervisors, elected department heads and other local officeholders.

Admittedly, no such restraint exists at the national level. But to apply the same principle seems to me a matter of simple ethics.

Each of us, in filing his candidacy for a 2-year term, knew what this job paid. Our election would seem to constitute a contract with the voters—a bargain that we have no opportunity to renegotiate until the next election.

This amendment makes it possible for us to raise the pay of future Congresses—not the one in which we were elected to serve. It imposes only a 6-month delay in implementing the change.

The amendment is logical, and it is right. I urge its adoption.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the motion to recommit. My reasons for doing so are exactly the same as those offered earlier by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

(Mr. BROTZMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT]. I do not intend to vote for a salary increase for Members of Congress either at $10,000 or $7,500 per annum. A vote for the motion actually is a vote to increase salaries of Congressmen by $7,500. I do not believe our Nation or the taxpayers of this country can afford it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

(Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to any increase in the congressional salaries at this time and therefore will vote against the motion to recommit the bill. This is an attempt to increase the salaries to $7,500 instead of the $10,000 as provided for in the bill.

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, during this debate I have heard over and over again the argument that our salaries and others provided for in this bill should be increased to that in industry. Frankly, I do not know what industry my friends and colleagues have been talking about.

The comparison I would like to make is with those in industry I am most familiar with. The great majority of the employees in industry in my own congressional district are employed in the textile industry. The textile industry has been having a difficult time. Many mills have closed since World War II and thousands of jobs have been lost because of foreign imports and through automation. Some of the mills have been operating on part time and on the stretchout system. There are no great profits in the textile industry today. Theirs is the struggle to exist and provide jobs.

Most textile wages in the United States average less than $1.80 per hour. When we start talking about industry, Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, these are the people who will have to pay for an increase of $10,000 in the salary of each Supreme Court Justice and Members of Congress. The money of industrial workers will be withheld by the Federal Government for this salary increase.

Mr. Chairman, paid vacations of my textile workers cannot compare with the vacations of those in the Federal Government. My textile workers and those in other industries generally throughout the country get 1 week of paid vacation annually even though they may have worked for 30 years. Mr. Chairman, those in the Federal Government with 15 years of service get 26 working days of paid vacation in addition to holidays.

Mr. Chairman, this is the comparison we should use during this debate The same could be said for our farmers. I know farmers who get no vacations, no holidays, and who have a net income of virtually zero when all bills are paid at the end of the year.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. Let us have an open rollcall vote and I urge the House to defeat this bill.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was amazed at some of the statements made by the last two speakers in which they complained about the fact they did not have the opportunity to vote on an amendment which would defer the effective date of the increase for the House until next January. My understanding is that there is such an amendment pending, and that the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Arizona is offered as a substitute. If the amendment which is now pending, offered by the gentleman from Ohio, is adopted, this will have the effect of deferring the effective date of the increase for the House of Representatives until January of 1965.

Mr. Chairman, I subscribe to the views of those who feel that when we set our own salaries an election ought to intervene before such increase becomes effective. I propose to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. His amendment, which I have checked at the desk, is in good form, and it will have the effect of deferring the effective date of the salary increases of Members of the House until January and make the other increases effective after passage of the act.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Let me say first of all that if we have an opportunity to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio I will vote for it, although I am not satisfied that it applies simply to the House. It ought to apply equally to the Members of both Houses. If there is an opportunity to vote for it, however, in view of the fact that evidently the parliamentary situation does not permit one that would apply to both Houses, I will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FRASER I may say to the gentleman that the other body can take care of its own problems. The amendment as now framed provides an adequate opportunity to defer the effective date for House Members.

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, whether or not the January 1965 date is adopted as the effective date for House Members, I shall support this bill. I would like to point out that this bill has many salary adjustments in it of importance to millions of Federal workers. The adjustments in the bill for Cabinet officials and other members of the executive branch, the increases for the judiciary, and the other provisions in the bill are long overdue. In some ways, it is unfortunate that the congressional salaries are also included in this bill, for these seem to have become the center of controversy.

For myself, the proposal of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], to provide a more modest increase for the Members of Congress but with separate provision for travel and for the additional expense of maintaining a home here in Washington more closely conformed to the problems which do indeed confront the Members of this House. For this reason I supported the Joelson amendment. I regret that the amendment did not receive more support.

Nevertheless, our Government will be made more effective in its work if this

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

bill becomes law as it now stands. I urge that it be supported by everyone interested in improving the quality of public service at the Federal level.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON) there were—ayes 159, noes 115.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOLTON] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, there is only one matter to be disposed of, and that is the matter the gentleman from Michigan and I discussed, about which I do not think there will be any argument. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all the titles of the bill and on the bill cease in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the substitute amendment agreed to for section 5 ends the debate on the bill, unless there is an amendment that has been agreed be offered by unanimous consent.

Mr. UDALL. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] be allowed to return to title II for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I object, Mr. Chairman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFIN

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: On page 76, between lines 6 and 7, insert a new title V as follows:

"TITLE V—INDEPENDENT BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

"SEC. 501. Notwithstanding the provisions of SEC. 303, the annual rate of basic compensation for members of each of the following regulatory agencies and commissions shall be $1,000 per year less than the rate of basic compensation hereinbefore provided for the Chai man of each such agency or commission. The agencies and commissions to which this section shall apply are the following: The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Maritime Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Labor Relations Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission."

And redesignate the succeeding title and sections accordingly.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that following the gentleman's 5 minutes for the presentation of his amendment all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the bill cease in 10 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, attention has previously been called to the language on page 45 of the bill, lines 24 and 25, which provides that the President is authorized from time to time to place numerous offices and positions in various categories or levels of compensation. This means that the President, whoever he might be, at any time could raise or lower the salaries of members of the several independent boards and commissions which have been created by the Congress to perform judicial functions.

Now, I do not know whether it is a good idea to allow the President to raise or lower salaries of officials in the various departments of his administration. I would not object, particularly, insofar as such authority might be applied to those officers in the various departments of Government who serve at the pleasure of the President. But I do not believe that any President should have that power with respect to such independent quasi-judicial boards and commissions as the ICC, and NLRB. The members of such boards and commissions have been appointed for fixed terms; their appointments must be approved by the Senate, and they are expected to serve independent of any kind of influence or suggestion of influence or pressure. In the past, the Congress and its committees have been properly concerned about certain activities which might tend to influence the decisions of these agencies. Whether or not a President would actually lower salaries of members of one of these agencies for any reason, the very fact that he would have the power under this bill to do so, could operate to influence or conceivably influence or affect the decisions of such agencies. I doubt that the committee gave this aspect of the bill very serious consideration because I doubt the committee would have approved this provision if its ramifications had been debated.

Since this bill just might become law, even though I cannot support it, I hope the House will make the change I have proposed.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. I think the gentleman is making a very constructive contribution to the bill, although I regret that he does not intend to support the bill, because I do think it is a good bill. But I would urge the House to approve the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I think it improves the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, it is never a very pleasant task to vote against salary increases for anyone and I think it is most unpleasant to be in a position to vote against a salary increase for one's own compensation.

I happen to be in this position. I do not feel that H.R. 8986 will accomplish the desired and stated objective which is the equalization of salaries among Federal Government and private industries. The legislation will only result in an increasing rise of salaries in industry and other parts of our economy. The overall result will be an inflationary trend in our Government.

I do not believe that a person who is elected to serve his Government within an elected or appointed capacity intended to become wealthy. If the individual did this, I think he is in the wrong business. If a person's only objective in life is making money, they should get out of Government service. I am not one who holds to the theory that we will be unable to induce competent people to serve in the Government if we do not raise salaries. I know that there are plenty of people who are willing to serve as Federal judges, Cabinet officers, sub-Cabinet officers, heads of departments, postal positions both administrative and otherwise, at the present salary level. There are also any number of people who are willing to serve as Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate at the present salary level.

Some of the specific provisions of the legislation which I believe are inappropriate concern some of the employees of the House of Representatives. For instance, the postmaster of the House of Representatives, under this proposed legislation, would receive more compensation than any other postmaster in our Nation.

Cabinet officers and sub-Cabinet officers would still receive, in addition to the increased salaries, all of the present emoluments of office, including private limousines with chauffeurs and, in some instances, airplanes.

Let us look at the Federal judiciary. Under this bill, a Federal judge, after 10 years of service, could retire for the rest of his life at $32,500 a year. I know of no vacancy in the Federal judiciary today which is not filled because competent applicants cannot be found to fill the job at the present salary. I do not think at this time we can preach economy in government and raise practically every Federal employee's salary, including our own, and still be consistent with an economy program.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8986 is a broad base legislative act to adjust the rates of basic compensation for certain officers and employees in the Federal Government. It includes among raises for the postal employees, for classified employees, raises for Members of the Congress, members of the President's Cabinet, and all members of the Federal judiciary.

Mr. Chairman, I realize completely the necessity for considering increases for those Federal employees in the postal service and those who are classified employees of the Federal Government. Since coming to the Congress, I have introduced legislation to provide pay raises for these employees of the Federal Government. I recognize there is merit to this bill relative to the need for increasing the salaries of these employees. In order for me to support this bill today, it appears that I must also vote for a salary increase for myself in the amount of $10,000. This, Mr. Chairman, I cannot do. This, Mr. Chairman, I will not do.

Further, it is my understanding that a motion will be made to decrease the

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

amount of proposed salary increase for Members of Congress to $7,500. I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, this I cannot do. This, Mr. Chairman, I will not do.

Mr. Chairman, in consideration of the severe economic difficulties in the State of West Virginia, I cannot, in good conscience, vote to increase my salary for any of the suggested sums. For, in both instances, they far exceed the annual income of the majority of the people I represent.

I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, therefore, that the provisions of this bill, as they affect a Member of the Congress, will be deleted in order that I may support the legislation. If this is not done, I have no alternative but to oppose it.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, while I support 95 percent of the pay bill before us today, H.R. 8986, and believe that the post office and civil service employees are entitled to the increase which the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service now recommends, I do have decided reservations about the salary increase proposed for Members of Congress.

Although Congress has not had an increase in pay in 9 years, and a case can be made for some increase at this time, I believe the amount recommended is inappropriate and inconsistent with our efforts to cut expenses in the Federal Government. How can I advocate reductions in other areas and not apply the rule to myself?

I am, therefore, opposed to title II in its present form covering congressional pay. Some economy has been effected under title I, however, by the committee's action in reducing the amounts of raises originally proposed so that they now come within the budget recommendations for this purpose. Moreover, the salary scales for the post office and civil service employees are, in this bill, brought into line with the comparability provisions of the legislation we enacted in the 87th Congress. This means that Federal classified employees will be receiving pay commensurate with that in private industry for equivalent duties and responsibilities.

Accordingly, I have today voted for every amendment which would lessen the increase for Congresmen, and I trust that the motion to recommit will prevail. In fact, I hope the reduction in congressional pay in the motion to recommit is much large than has been suggested.

When the bill comes up for final passage, however, because I believe that such a large portion of it is fair and just, I intend to support it.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8986.

At a time when Members of Congress should be setting an example of economy and thrift, we find ourselves in the impossible position of voting on a bill which would increase our salaries by $10,000 a year, an amount larger than the total income of most families in our respective congressional districts.

On the basis of what has been done—and what has not been done—in Congress in the past year, I think there are a great many people in this Nation who would question whether Members of Congress are worth their present salaries, much less this increase.

All of us are aware, I am sure, that there was some difficulty in a number of congressional committees in holding hearings and conducting committee sessions last year.

It seemed that when important bills were up before committees for consideration, efforts to find enough Members were something less than successful.

I imagine that the proponents of this bill would have us believe that the high cost of living kept many Members from remaining in the Nation's Capital, and that they were forced to flee to Paris and the Caribbean to escape the temptations and the high living of the Washington area.

I believe we can pardon our constituents if they look not too kindly on such reasoning.

The fact is that this bill would provide a 44-percent pay increase for Members of Congress. It would provide this pay increase without event going through the formality of waiting for the next congressional session to take effect.

There have been no valid arguments for these increases—and until there are—they should not be granted.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, this administration has embarked on a great austerity program. The people of this country have been bombarded with propaganda about how the Chief Executive plans to cut Government spending. To many people much of this program seems so deceiving and fallacious. On February 25, this House voted to cut the taxes of this country. Because it assured a further increase of the national debt, I could not in good conscience support that legislation. Today I cannot in good conscience support this pay raise bill as reported. Furthermore, I cannot see how the Members of this House, who just recently voted for a tax cut, can support legislation that will increase the deficit to over $12 billion.

We were assured when the tax bill was passed that an effort would be made to hold down spending. Yet today we are faced with a bill that would add over $600 million to the cost of the Federal payroll yearly.

This is not to say that I can see no justification for some of the pay raises in this bill. Undoubtedly, many are justifiable, especially those in the postal salary schedules and in the grades of the other civil service classifications.

There may even be some justification in raising the salaries of higher governmental officials, including Members of Congress. But, in view of the other action we have taken in this Chamber this year in failing to recognize sound fiscal policy, I cannot see how we can have the audacity to raise our own pay.

Before we can fully justify a pay raise for ourselves, we must become fiscally responsible. It is inconceivable that one could call the passage of this bill an example of fiscal integrity.

Often before in this House I have talked about the dangers of inflation. You may say, What part does inflation have in this debate?

Simply this: At the present time our economy is booming. With the tax cut even more money will be flowing. By passing this bill we will not only be putting more money into the economy through pay raises, but we will be increasing Government spending at a time when Government income is not commensurate to expenditures. This is bound to create a dangerous and explosive situation. To say this is a potential inflationary situation is really an understatement. Passage of this bill makes an already dangerous situation more dangerous, it creates even greater problems. Because of adverse effects this has on retired employees any inflation is a cruel tax. Unless expenditures of this Government are brought in line with its income, we will continue to tax the American people in this grossly unfair manner.

We should work harder at correcting existing and still unchecked loopholes in the tax structure. If tax reform was truly achieved, many of the problems with which we are now faced would dissipate.

I am especially opposed to raising the salaries of Members of Congress at this time. Until we can prove that we are deserving of a raise we should not consider this action. I do not believe our actions have justified or have proofed our deserving a raise.

Let us look at the record. Last year we were in session the entire year all the way through December. We met only 186 days for 119 rollcall votes. In 1982 we adjourned in mid-October, the 13th to be exact. Yet that year we met for 177 days or 9 fewer than last year and incredibly enough we took 124 rollcall votes, 5 more than last year.

I believe that this is a clear indication that there is something wrong with Congress. We need to reform ourselves, have a housecleaning if you please before we should pat ourselves on the back with a raise.

We must become a more effective, efficient and responsible body before we can become deserving of any new monetary rewards. How can a Congress that discriminates against its minority deserve a pay raise? We in the minority have brought before the attention of this Congress a situation that demands immediate attention. The minority in this Congress is entitled to adequate professional staff assistance. Yet this House has failed to recognize or even attempt to deal realistically with this problem.

I say that this Congress must first prove to the people of this country that it deserves a raise. We can do so by acting fiscally responsible with reforms in both spending and tax structure. We can do so by becoming a more responsible, effective and efficient body. We can do so by adopting the necessary reforms that would make us that kind of a body. Until and unless we are willing to reform our tax system and our spending habits we do not deserve a raise.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the House has been considering the Federal Employees Salary Act, a bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the Federal service. This measure was recommended by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee after a series of hearings and a number of executive sessions.

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

The proposal covers four distinct categories:

Section 1 proposes increases for 1,697,063 employees of the classified, postal and foreign service, together with certain Veterans Administration and Agriculture employees at a total cost of $576 million.

Section 2 urges a salary boost for 8,179 legislative employees, including House and Senate Members of Congress, at a cost of $11 million.

Section 3 calls for increases to 400 Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officers of the executive branch in the amount of $4 million.

Section 4 provides for increased wages to 6,255 judicial employees and Federal judges at an annual cost of $9,500,000.

The Committee bill, collectively, provides 1,711,897 employees of the Federal Establishment with pay increases of at least $601 million. From my past experience in dealing with cost estimates on Federal legislative proposals prepared and submitted by the various agencies, I would venture to guess that figure is low. Despite any cuts made in the House today, the cost will perhaps exceed that amount by 10 to 15 percent.

In my opinion, this legislation is extravagant in all categories; it contains many inequities; the $10,000 boosts have not been justified; and a general wage increase does not appear to be warranted at this time. In a period of 15 months, the Congress has provided Federal employees with a pay increase on January 1, 1963, another one on January 1, 1964, and a tax cut on March 1, 1964—which was primarily designed to provide more take home pay for the wage-earner. Now, another increase has been proposed to take effect upon passage of this bill.

Before we have another spiral of wage increases, let us first evaluate what effect the recent tax cut will have upon the economy. Here we are being asked to approve legislation for pay raises, and no employee in this Nation has as yet had chance to feel the extra dollar in his pay check. We do not know whether the tax-cut theory is going to work and provide the economic advantages it was principally designed to provide.

Above all, however, it is fiscally unsound at this time when the Federal debt is so high, cutbacks in personnel are being demanded, military bases are closed for economy reasons, and less Federal spending is being advocated.

I fully realize that there are instances in the Federal pay system that rightly need adjustment, but the approach used by this bill to correct those injustices is—in my opinion—unconscionable.

The President has called for an attack on poverty in the United States—it seems to me that raising Federal salaries over $600 million annually is a poor way of solving the problem in our midst. The Chief Executive has called upon business to hold its price line, and labor its wage line until a better balance in the economy can be achieved. Is the Government operating under a separate set of standards? Are we different than those in non-Government activities? The executive, legislative, and judicial branches should provide an example and not lull the country into another round of inflationary prices, wages, and living costs. The poor, those on fixed incomes, retirement and veteran pensions are the ones who would suffer most.

The U.S. Government consists of 191,259,346 Americans. Each and everyone of us tries as best we can to live within our means. When we incur a debt—in order to provide the necessities of life—we make arrangements from our income for systematic methods of repayment. So should our Government. When spending is increased, revenue should be raised to balance the budget.

Over the past many years, this does not seem to be the concern of responsible leaders—their motive appears to be spend today and let the future generations worry about paying it back. Our children and grandchildren will have to cope with their own problems through life—why should we recklessly abandon our responsibilities and obligations. If this pay raise is so necessary, then let the proponents also recommend a way to pay for it.

Who are the principal advocates of this legislation? I hold in my hand the letters and telegrams received yesterday urging my support and approval to the pending bill.

They are from the United Federation of Postal Clerks, National Association of Post Office Employees, National Association of Letter Carriers, National Association of Postmasters of the United States, Government Employees Council, AFL–CIO, American Federation of Government Employees, Pennsylvania State Association of Letter Carriers, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the American Bar Association, Pennsylvania Bar Association, and the Erie County Bar Association.

In addition, I have received a lengthy communication from the National Civil Service League releasing statements from the following business and industrial leaders who support increased compensation for Cabinet officers, Members of Congress, and judges.

They are Ralph E. Ablon, chairman and president, Ogden Corp.; Winthrop W. Aldrich, board of directors, Rockefeller Center, Inc.; John D. Biggers, chairman, Finance Committee Libbey, Owens, Ford Glass Co.; Roger M. Blough, chairman, United States Steel Corp.; Harold Boeschenstein, chairman, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.; Lucius D. Clay, senior partner, Lehman Bros.; John Cowles, president, the Minneapolis Star and Tribune; Henry Ford, chairman, Ford Motor Co.; Clarence Francis, industrialist; G. Keith Funston, president, New York Stock Exchange; C. R. Smith, president, American Airlines; T. S. Petersen, director, Standard Oil Co. of California; and Sidney J. Weinberg, partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co.

Now these gentlemen are respected business leaders of this country, but I doubt whether any one would advocate salary boosts in their respective firms if they were operating in the red as our Government has been doing. I am sure that any official in their organization who supported such a fiscal policy and huge expenditures would be immediately replaced. Furthermore, if the fiscal affairs of any company were operated as the Federal Government handles its receipts and expenditures, I know it would not exist very long. How then can responsible people of this Nation advocate that the Federal Treasury can stand such an outlay, continually spend the taxpayers money with reckless abandon, and not attempt to make the outgo balance the income?

So I say, Mr. Chairman, Congress would be deplorably derelict in its duty to approve this massive pay raise bill to give increased salaries to its Members, Cabinet, judges, high Government officials, bureaucrats, and every Federal employee.

The Federal budget cannot afford this excessive expenditure regardless of the need for, or the desirability of, the increase. Common respect should demand that the top bracket groups on the Federal payroll provide leadership in making the sacrifices the President has constantly asked for, and the people are demanding. The Congress and executive departments should strive to eliminate extravagance and diligently seek to reduce the huge national debt—thus the resultant stabilization of the dollar will lower living costs to the advantage of every American.

I do not believe that it is fair to the taxpayers who foot the bills, and to future generations who will bear the burden to add to this staggering national debt.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for me to understand how the Members of this body can vote for a Federal pay raise bill at this time. Less than 1 month ago Congress voted to reduce taxes by $11.5 billion. I voted against this bill, because I have always felt that if taxes are cut, there should be a comparable cut in spending. Certainly, all of us will agree that taxes are too high, but the cold hard fact is that taxes are high because spending is high. At that time we heard a lot of talk about economy and reduced spending, but the record was that since the passage of the tax cut bill, every appropriation bill and authorization measure that this body has acted upon has exceeded the spending and authorizations which were provided in fiscal 1964.

It is amazing that the President has talked of economy, frugality, and war on poverty. And yet where does the administration propose to start the drive in its war on poverty? By recommending a pay increase which will cost the taxpayers $545 million.

I shall not take the time of this body to discuss the pros and cons of the various increases which have been provided. These can be found in the committee report. The fact is that for 26 of the past 33 years, we have operated on a deficit basis—always adding more to the public debt. Twenty-two billion dollars in the red will be our record for the past 3 fiscal years. Does any Member of this body think the administrative officers of a corporation would recommend increases for themselves and their employees on that kind of a record?

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Let the department heads and the bureau chiefs spend more time looking for areas to save money and less time dreaming up new ways to spend more money.

Let the Congress face up to its responsibilities and act as legislators and not as a jury to pass on the executive recommendations.

Let us stop delegating our powers, and when such action is necessary insist that the agencies remain the servant of the Congress and not of the executive branch. Let us insist that spending shall not exceed our revenues.

Do these things, and there will be no objection by the taxpayers to legislation of this nature.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8986) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 650, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CORBETT. I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Iowa rise?

Mr. GROSS. Under the rules of the House, Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, a member of the committee who is unqualifiedly opposed to the bill takes precedence over a member who qualifies his opposition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is opposed to the bill in its present form.

Mr. GROSS. I am opposed to it unqualifiedly.

The SPEAKER. Since the gentleman from Pennsylvania is opposed to the bill in its present form, the Chair rules that the gentleman from Pennsylvania qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CORBETT moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8986 to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 40, line 6, strike out "$32,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000".

Page 40, line 9, strike out "$30,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$28,000".

Page 40, line 14, strike out "$29,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500".

Page 40, line 21, strike out "$28,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000".

Page 40, line 23, strike out "$26,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,000".

Page 41, line 8, strike out "$32,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000".

Page 41, line 10, strike out "$45,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$42,500".

Page 41, line 22, strike out "$35,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,500".

Page 42, line 10, strike out "$32,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000".

Page 43, line 7, strike out "$30,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$28,500".

Page 46, line 14, strike out "$29,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500".

Page 46, line 20, strike out "$28,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$26,500".

Page 47, line 2, strike out "$26,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000".

Page 47, line 6, strike out "$45,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$42,500".

Page 74, line 14, strike out "$45,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$43,000".

Page 74, line 15, strike out "$45,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$42,500".

Page 74, line 18, strike out "$35,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,500".

Page 74, line 21, strike out "$32,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000".

Page 74, line 22, strike out "$33,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,500".

Page 74, line 25, strike out "$35,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,500".

Page 75, line 4, strike out "$35,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,500".

Page 75, line 7, strike out "$32,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000".

Page 75, line 13, strike out "$29,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$27,500".

Page 75, line 14, strike out "$28,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$26,500".

Page 75, line 20, strike out "$28,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$26,000".

Page 76, line 3, strike out "$32,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000".

Page 76, line 6, strike out "$35,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,500".

Mr. CORBETT (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read. They have been fully explained and debated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 222, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—184

Addabbo	Becker	Brooks
Albert	Bell	Broyhill, Va.
Ashley	Bennett, Mich.	Buckley
Aspinall	Blatnik	Burke
Auchincloss	Boggs	Burkhalter
Barrett	Bolling	Burton, Calif.
Bates	Bow	Byrne, Pa.
Cahill	Holland	Pike
Cameron	Horton	Pool
Carey	Jennings	Price
Celler	Joelson	Pucinski
Cohelan	Johnson, Calif.	Purcell
Cooley	Karsten	Reuss
Corman	Karth	Rivers, Alaska
Daddario	Kastenmeier	Rivers, S.C.
Daniels	Kee	Rodino
Davis, Ga.	Kelly	Rogers, Colo.
Dawson	Keogh	Rooney, N.Y.
Delaney	King, N.Y.	Rooney, Pa.
Dent	Kirwan	Roosevelt
Diggs	Kluczynski	Rosenthal
Dingell	Kunkel	Rostenkowski
Donohue	Lankford	Roybal
Downing	Leggett	Ryan, Mich.
Dulski	Lesinski	Ryan, N.Y.
Edwards	Libonati	St Germain
Ellsworth	Long, Md.	St. Onge
Fallon	McCulloch	Sibal
Farbstein	McDowell	Sickles
Fascell	McFall	Sisk
Feighan	McMillan	Slack
Finnegan	Macdonald	Smith, Iowa
Fino	Madden	Staebler
Flood	Mailliard	Stafford
Fogarty	Martin, Mass.	Staggers
Fraser	Matsunaga	Stephens
Frelinghuysen	Michel	Stratton
Friedel	Miller, Calif.	Sullivan
Fulton, Pa.	Milliken	Talcott
Gallagher	Minish	Thomas
Garmatz	Monagan	Thompson, La.
Gary	Moorhead	Thompson, N.J.
Giaimo	Morgan	Thompson, Tex
Gilbert	Morrison	Toll
Gill	Morse	Trimble
Glenn	Moss	Tupper
Gonzalez	Multer	Tuten
Grabowski	Murphy, Ill.	Udall
Gray	Murray	Ullman
Gubser	Nedzi	Van Pelt
Hagen, Calif.	Nix	Vinson
Halpern	O'Brien, N.Y.	Wallhauser
Hanna	O'Hara, Ill.	Westland
Hansen	O'Hara, Mich.	White
Harding	Olsen, Mont.	Widnall
Hardy	O'Neill	Willis
Hawkins	Osmers	Wilson, Charles H.
Hays	Ostertag	Wright
Healey	Passman	Young
Hébert	Patman	Zablocki
Hoffman	Pepper	
Holifield	Philbin	

NAYS—222

Abbitt	Clawson, Del	Hechler
Abele	Cleveland	Hemphill
Abernethy	Collier	Henderson
Adair	Colmer	Herlong
Alger	Conte	Hoeven
Anderson	Corbett	Horan
Andrews, Ala.	Cramer	Hosmer
Andrews, N. Dak.	Cunningham	Huddleston
	Curtin	Hull
Arends	Curtis	Hutchinson
Ashbrook	Dague	Ichord
Ashmore	Derounian	Jarman
Ayres	Derwinski	Jensen
Baldwin	Devine	Johansen
Baring	Dole	Johnson, Pa.
Barry	Dorn	Johnson, Wis.
Beckworth	Dwyer	Jonas
Beermann	Edmondson	Jones, Ala.
Belcher	Everett	Jones, Mo.
Bennett, Fla.	Evins	Keith
Berry	Findley	Kilburn
Betts	Fisher	Kilgore
Boland	Flynt	Knox
Bolton, Frances P.	Ford	Kornegay
	Foreman	Kyl
Bolton, Oliver P.	Forrester	Laird
	Fountain	Landrum
Bonner	Fulton, Tenn.	Langen
Bray	Fuqua	Latta
Brock	Gathings	Lennon
Bromwell	Gibbons	Lindsay
Broomfield	Goodell	Lipscomb
Brotzman	Goodling	Lloyd
Brown, Ohio	Grant	Long, La.
Broyhill, N.C.	Griffin	McClory
Bruce	Gross	McDade
Burleson	Grover	McIntire
Burton, Utah	Gurney	McLoskey
Byrnes, Wis.	Hagan, Ga.	MacGregor
Cannon	Haley	Mahon
Casey	Hall	Marsh
Cederberg	Halleck	Martin, Calif.
Chamberlain	Harris	Martin, Nebr.
Chelf	Harrison	Matthews
Chenoweth	Harsha	May
Clancy	Harvey, Ind.	Miller, N.Y.
Clark	Harvey, Mich.	Mills

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9

Minshall	Roberts, Tex.	Stubblefield
Montoya	Robison	Taft
Moore	Rogers, Fla.	Taylor
Morris	Rogers, Tex.	Teague, Calif.
Morton	Roudebush	Teague, Tex.
Mosher	Roush	Thomson, Wis.
Natcher	Rumsfeld	Tollefson
Norblad	St. George	Tuck
O'Konski	Saylor	Utt
Olson, Minn.	Schadeberg	Van Deerlin
Pelly	Schenck	Vanik
Perkins	Schneebeli	Waggonner
Pickle	Schweiker	Watson
Pilcher	Schwengel	Watts
Pillion	Secrest	Weaver
Pirnie	Selden	Weltner
Poage	Senner	Whalley
Poff	Short	Wharton
Quie	Shriver	Whitener
Quillen	Sikes	Whitten
Randall	Siler	Wickersham
Reid, Ill.	Skubitz	Williams
Reid, N.Y.	Smith, Calif.	Wilson, Bob
Reifel	Smith, Va.	Wilson, Ind.
Rhodes, Ariz.	Snyder	Winstead
Rhodes, Pa.	Springer	Wydler
Rich	Steed	Wyman
Richlman	Stinson	Younger

NOT VOTING—28

Avery	Dowdy	Nelsen
Bass	Duncan	O'Brien, Ill.
Battin	Elliott	Patten
Brademas	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Griffiths	Rains
Clausen, Don H.	King, Calif.	Roberts, Ala.
	Mathias	Scott
Davis, Tenn.	Meader	Sheppard
Denton	Murphy, N.Y.	Shipley

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brademas for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. King of California for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Battin against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Don H. Clausen against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Nelsen against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Meader against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Roberts of Alabama.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Elliott.

Mr. Patten with Mr. Duncan.

Mr. BECKER and Mr. OSTERTAG changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MARCH 16

(Mr. BRUCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the rest of the week and for next week as well?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. This concludes the legislative business for this week, and I will ask unanimous consent to go over at the conclusion of announcing the program.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day. There is one suspension, H.R. 9711, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Tuesday, the Interior Department appropriations bill, 1965.

Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 10300, authorizing construction for the military departments and Reserve components; and

H.R. 5838, amending the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be called up at any time, and that any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 16

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM STUDY: UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ECONOMIST CALLS FOR RULES FOR THE CONDUCT OF MONETARY POLICY—TRUSTS CONGRESS RATHER THAN BANKERS

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House has been hearing testimony from the Nation's most outstanding economists on the Federal Reserve's structure and policies. What the Federal Reserve does has effects on employment, prices, business profits, interest rates, gross national product, and other economic variables. It is, therefore, of utmost importance for all of us to be as informed as possible about the Federal Reserve's structure and policies.

On Tuesday, March 3, Prof. Milton Friedman, the Paul Snowden Russell distinguished service professor of economics at the University of Chicago, testified before the subcommittee. Professor Friedman has made path-breaking contributions to our knowledge of the Nation's money system and the effects of monetary policy on the economy's performance. His work has commanded the attention of all economists, and though they do not all agree with everything he says, they have paid all of it attention. Both before and after Professor Friedman's appearance before the subcommittee, other witnesses spent considerable time commenting on his ideas. Professor Friedman is known as a conservative economist. I do not agree with all of his ideas, but I found much of Professor Friedman's testimony to be eminently sensible and all of it worth careful consideration. Excerpts from his statements and remarks follow:

EXCERPTS FROM "SHOULD THERE BE AN INDEPENDENT MONETARY AUTHORITY," BY PROFESSOR FRIEDMAN

Central bankers * * * have tended to attach great importance to stability of the exchange rate * * * and prevention of inflation. They have therefore tended to oppose many of the proposals for extending the scope of government. This coincidence of their views in these respects with those of people like myself, who regard narrowly limited government as a requisite for a free society, is the source of much of the sympathy on the part of this group, whom I shall call new liberals, for the notion of an independent central bank.

One defect of an independent central bank * * * is that it almost inevitably involves dispersal of responsibility. If we examine the monetary system in terms not of nominal institutional organization but of the economic functions performed, we find that the central bank is hardly ever the only authority in the Government that has essential monetary powers. * * * In practice, therefore, even if something called an independent central bank is established * * * there remains other governmental authorities, particularly the fiscal authority collecting taxes and dispersing funds and managing the debt, which also have a good deal of monetary power. * * * Our present division of responsibility for debt management between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury is very inefficient. * * * In the past few years, I have read through the annual reports of the Federal Reserve System from 1913 to date, seriatim. On of the few amusing dividends from that ordeal was seeing the cyclical pattern that shows up in the potency that the authorities attribute to monetary policy. In years when things are going well, the reports emphasize that monetary policy is an exceedingly potent weapon and that the favorable course of events is largely a result of the skillful handling of this delicate instrument by the monetary authority. In years of depression, on the other hand, the reports emphasize that monetary policy is but one of many tools of economic policy, that its power is highly limited, and that it was only the skillful handling of such limited powers as were available that averted disaster. This is an example of the effect of the dispersal of responsibility * * * no one assumes or is assigned the final responsibility.

Another defect of the conduct of monetary policy through an independent central bank that has a good deal of leeway and power is the extent to which policy is thereby made highly dependent on personalities. In studying the history of American monetary policy, I have been struck by the extraordinary importance of accidents of personality. * * * A similar situation prevails today. The actions of the Reserve System depend on whether there are a few persons in the System who exert intellectual leadership.

A third technical defect is that an independent central bank will almost inevitably give undue emphasis to the point of view of bankers * * * since the banking community

Approved For Release 2005/05/18 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000500050001-9